



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 2015

No. 37

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Father in Heaven, holy is Your Name. You brought light from darkness and order from chaos. You can bring order to our Nation and world. Thank You for the gift of this day and for our borrowed heartbeats. Thank You also for the privilege to serve You by serving our great country.

Use our lawmakers to do Your will. May they become Your merciful hands to reduce the pain and pathology in our world. Lord, use their daily experiences of joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain, victory and defeat for Your glory. Protect them with the shield of Your love as You fill their hearts with Your peace.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2015.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 625

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 625) to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

KEYSTONE BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, construction of the Keystone Pipeline would pump billions into our economy, it would support thousands of jobs, and a bipartisan majority in both the House and Senate voted to support it.

Today the Senate will vote to support American jobs and infrastructure one more time. It should be a no-brainer. For a long time, projects like Keystone basically were no-brainers. They were often approved without much controversy at all. But that was

before powerful special interests and ideological extremists decided to embark on a quixotic crusade.

The implication that building Keystone would result in some sort of apocalyptic cataclysm has always flown in the face of science. Even the assertion that Keystone would have significant impact on global climate ignores the scientific findings of President Obama's own State Department; it said the environmental impact would be minimal.

The reality is that the energy resources in question are almost certainly going to come out of the ground whether or not Keystone is built. The real question here is whether we are going to allow Keystone's energy to help support middle-class jobs in America or whether we will allow those jobs and energy to potentially be sent to high-polluting countries such as China. Deep-pocketed leftists and extremists appear to prefer the latter option.

By vetoing the bipartisan Keystone jobs bill, President Obama sided with those moneyed special interests over the middle class, and it is still unclear why. It can't be about protecting the climate because vetoing the bipartisan bill would hardly have an effect. It can't be about protecting a broken review process the President himself broke long ago because this bipartisan bill seeks to fix the review process. And it can't be about giving the President more time because he has delayed this decision for years on end. Here is the only serious explanation I can think of: President Obama is signaling to extreme special interests that his party is turning away from workers and toward them.

We have seen how the President's veto has outraged some in the labor union community. I know it makes some of our Democratic colleagues pretty uncomfortable as well. I suspect that includes Democrats who didn't support the Senate's initial passage of Keystone. I suspect it also includes

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1263

Democrats who might otherwise support their leadership's unprecedented filibuster of a veto-override motion.

I am urging every Democrat who still believes their party should be about workers, not deep-pocketed special interests and extremists, to join us. Vote for cloture. Vote to override. Keystone's bipartisan coalition in the Senate is only a few votes shy of the two-thirds majority we would need to override this partisan veto and bring Keystone's jobs here to America. And it is not too late to stop your party from venturing down a path even further afield from the interests of American workers and the middle class. So join us. Together, let's support Keystone's American jobs and infrastructure.

KING V. BURWELL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, across the street the Supreme Court will hear arguments today in an important case. King v. Burwell is the latest reminder of a law that is as unwieldy as it is unworkable—ObamaCare.

ObamaCare has been one rolling disaster after another for middle-class Americans. First, it attacked seniors by raiding Medicare to finance more government spending. Then it canceled health plans for many who had been told they would be able to keep the plans they liked. And who could forget the Web site debacle? The hits have kept on coming ever since—fewer choices, higher costs, increased tax burdens borne by the middle class, and even more headaches at tax time. In fact, we now know that the Obama administration sent inaccurate ObamaCare tax information to nearly 1 million people. America's middle class deserves a lot better than the hurt of ObamaCare.

We have heard a lot of predictions about what might happen if the Court finds for the plaintiffs in this case, but we have also seen Republican ideas about how to help Americans who may be harmed again by ObamaCare's broken promises. For instance, Republicans think it is better to give Americans and States the freedom to choose what is right for them rather than trying to impose costly mandates from Washington such as ObamaCare.

Regardless of how the Supreme Court rules, I look forward to continuing to work with my Republican colleagues because while ObamaCare is a law that is all about higher costs and broken promises, Republicans think health care should be about helping middle-class Americans instead.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, most of the issues that come before this body are complex and nuanced. Rarely are we faced with simple issues. But today we have a very simple, clear-cut issue before us. It is as straightforward and clear-cut as any one question could be. Do you support American workers or do you not support American workers?

Under our law, workers have the right to unionize and have their voices heard in the workplace. Through elections, workers choose for themselves whether to form a union.

Last year the National Labor Relations Board took important steps to modernize and streamline union election procedures—commonsense, simple advancements. Rule changes are good for workers and good for businesses.

This whole fight isn't about business versus workers. We would have to search long and hard to find a business that opposes what the NLRB did. It is all the anti-union rhetoric of the Republicans here in the Senate.

The reform that the NLRB pushed forward allows employers and unions to file forms electronically—kind of the modern world in which we all live. It also allows communications with workers by email and cell phone—pretty reasonable, it sounds like to me. Yet today Senate Republicans are trying to roll back rule changes instituted by the NLRB.

Later this afternoon we will vote on a resolution of disapproval to undo these commonsense reforms. Republicans think they are striking a blow against labor unions with votes like today's, but what they are really doing is undermining American families.

American workers and their families have come to rely on many of the benefits provided by collective bargaining: higher wages, safe working conditions, decent health care. It is no surprise that some of the most prosperous times in American history—namely, the middle 20th century—came about in times of record union membership. Even today in my home State of Nevada, unions protect wages for casino employees on the Las Vegas Strip, up at Lake Tahoe, and all over the State. We ensure through the unions safe working conditions—certainly for miners in Elko and around the State—and also, with rare exception, quality health coverage for educators statewide.

So I want to be very clear. This is about whom the Republicans really are attacking, and it is the middle class. Each time Republicans throw roadblocks for workers to organize, they are weakening the middle class.

I support American families. I support American workers. I support the middle class. Senate Democrats support the middle class. We do not support this Republican attack on unions. We will vigorously fight any attempt to weaken worker protections, including today's resolution vote.

OBAMACARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will briefly comment on my friend the Republican leader further trying to come to the floor once again to try to minimize the disastrous attacks on ObamaCare.

The House has voted 57 times to repeal that law. Each time, the result is the same. As Albert Einstein said, the definition of insanity is someone who does something over and over again and gets the same results. So it is insane what they have done in the House, and it is really insane what they are trying to do here in the Senate.

There is no question about the case before the U.S. Supreme Court. The language is clear. Almost 10 million people will lose health insurance. And we have seen in the press the last few days that very terrible things would happen to families if they lost their health care. What my friend the Republican leader is talking about doing is turning it back to the insurance industry. If you had a preexisting disability, no insurance. They set arbitrary limits as to how much they would pay. It was a time of dread for families who were trying to insure their boys and girls, mothers and fathers.

So I hope the Supreme Court will listen to the will of the American people and the will of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives which passed this law. We all knew the intent of Congress. We still do. The law is very clear, and the Supreme Court should follow the law.

Mr. President, will the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 8, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate remaining, equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the minority and the majority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the median time today between when a union files an organizing petition and when employees vote on whether to unionize is 38 days, or just slightly over one month. Some 95 percent of all organizing elections take place less than 2 months after the date an organizing petition is filed, and approximately 70 percent of these elections are won by unions. All in all, I think anyone would agree that unions are doing pretty well and that this is a pretty fair process.

In fact, the current median time between union organizing petitions and union elections surpasses the goal set by the National Labor Relations Board itself. One would think it would be a classic case of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."

Apparently the Obama nominees on the National Labor Relations Board don't agree. They proposed a new rule which will go into effect next month and that will drastically shorten the time between the initial organizing union petition and the union elections to anywhere from 11 to 22 days.

While the current situation, if anything, gives an advantage to unions, it also provides adequate time for employers to express any concerns and for employees to hear the pros and cons of the union proposal. The new NLRB rule would remove these protections.

Businesses would have to respond to the union organizing petition within 7 days of its being filed, which would leave employers scrambling to research any arguments they want to bring up at the union organizing hearing. Small businesses, which frequently lack experience dealing with unions or in-house counsel to provide advice, would be hit particularly hard by this rule.

But it is not just businesses that would suffer. Under the new rule employees would have very little chance to research and consider the benefits and drawbacks of joining a union. They would be forced into a hasty decision with little opportunity to change their minds later on.

In addition, the rule also presents substantial privacy concerns for employees. Under the current system, employers already have to give unions employees' names and home addresses. The new rule would expand that disclosure requirement to include employees' cell phone numbers, email addresses, work schedules, and shift locations. Worse, the rule contains no additional requirements for safeguarding that information or disposing of it appropriately. Given the ever-growing concerns about privacy, it is astonishing that any employer would be forced to give up so much sensitive information without the explicit permission of his employees.

This new rule is unfair to employers and it is unfair to workers. There is a reason it is called the ambush elections rule. It would ambush employers and employees alike. Unions would have unlimited time to organize, while employers would be given almost no time to present their concerns and exercise their free speech and due process rights. Employees would be pushed into making the long-term decision about whether to join a union without all the facts.

Government should not be in the business of tilting the playing field in favor of unions at the expense of workers and businesses. The NLRB'S ambush elections rule is unfair and undemocratic. I hope Congress will pass the joint resolution of disapproval we are considering today, and I hope the President will sign it. The rights of American workers and businesses should not be sacrificed to the demands of unions.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLIS. 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. TILLIS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to support S.J. Res. 8. I thank my friend and colleague from Tennessee for bringing the resolution to the floor to disapprove the rule that the National Labor Relations Board has proposed that basically creates what are commonly referred to as ambush elections for votes to create labor unions in workplaces.

The concerns I have with this NLRB mandate is that it is another draconian example of what I consider to be the hyperpartisan business and labor environment the National Labor Relations Board has created over the last several years. The NLRB is advancing a pro-union agenda nationwide in the guise of government policy. The NLRB's proposed policy is simply not necessary, particularly in light of the fact that some 70 percent of union organizing elections already succeed under the NLRB's current policy. Clearly the pro-union majority of the National Labor Relations Board is not satisfied with unions winning 70 percent of the time. They now want to run up the score so the unions win 100 percent of the time.

Many people, when they think about labor unions and organizing, think about big business, but I am here to talk about the negative effect this proposal will have on small businesses. A 50-employee operation or a 250-employee operation, is a business that does not have the legal, financial, or administrative resources that a big business has to be able to react in the short timeframe the NLRB wants to mandate.

Today the median time for holding elections on labor union organizing pe-

titions is about 38 days. This rule would bring that down to just 8 days before an election would be required to be held. This would make it virtually impossible for the vast majority of America's small businesses to respond to the unionization effort and many of the employees themselves who may not want to be unionized would be swept aside by the compressed timeframe as well.

We have several examples of this in North Carolina, but rather than get into a lot of details, I will just explain why this new ambush election rule is not needed.

The petitions to unionize workplaces are already handled expeditiously. As I said, the average or median time for holding a vote is now 38 days. And again, the success rate for the unions is 70 percent. Let me say that again, 70 percent of the elections that are held under the NLRB's current rules result in employees being unionized.

By turning elections into this sort of ambush will put small businesses at a severe disadvantage against the powerful unions targeting them. For instance, take one small trucking company down in Greensboro, NC, that would suffer serious economic consequences if this rule goes into effect. Guy M. Turner, Inc. was founded by two brothers in 1924 and 90 years later it is still a family owned business employing less than 250 people, clearly it is not a mega-corporation. Yet, if the NLRB imposes this new rule, this family business will have: little time to obtain competent counsel to counter union targeting of the company, little time to answer questions, marshal facts, or prepare arguments to share with their employees regarding the potential consequences and effects of unionization.

And if that were not bad enough, under the NLRB's new proposal, employers would also be prohibited from expressing any views regarding the unionization effort—thus essentially eliminating the employer's right to free speech regarding the potential adverse effects of unionization on the workplace and the company's future viability. However, the NLRB's new rule would impose no such restrictions on a big union's right to speak in favor of unionization or the future benefits they promise it will deliver.

A little common sense and a hard look at reality clearly demonstrates that the regulations enforced today are working not only effectively, but in favor of large unions most of the time. I hope Senators will support Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee chairman LAMAR ALEXANDER, and the thousands of businesses and hundreds of thousands of employees, who oppose this regulation because it is an unnecessary and ill-advised effort to tilt the playing field in the workplace totally in favor of the large labor unions and their efforts to unionize the American workplace.

I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be equally divided.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is the pending order for the morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on S.J. Res. 8 with divided time.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Chair.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this morning I rise, along with the women of the Senate, to speak about the issue of human trafficking.

We are 4 days from International Women's Day, and all of the women of the Senate have taken up the issue of human trafficking. Many of us wish to speak about it today. We are all working on it. Many have been leaders on this issue. My colleagues will see Republican and Democratic women coming to the floor.

As the senior woman and senior Democratic woman, I have convened over the years a dinner among the women of the Senate. The purpose of the dinner was to create a zone of civility, to create camaraderie, as well as to see where we could work across the aisle to focus on a particular issue.

The women of the Senate do not have a caucus. There is no lockstep. We discuss our different views on budgets and bottom lines and other issues. We discuss questions such as, What is the best way to approach the deficit? What are all of the deficits in our country we are facing, not only the fiscal deficit, but the deficit in research and development, and other deficits?

At one of our dinners we said, What is it that we want to work on together in this particular Congress? What is the issue that brings us all together across party lines that would have an impact on what we do at home, what would have an impact in our global community, and what would have an impact particularly on women and children, girls and boys, around the world? That is what we decided we wanted to work on—the despicable, vile issue of human trafficking. Human trafficking. That means a whole organized network and networks to buy and sell human beings as if they are a commodity, to buy and sell girls and to buy and sell little boys for the whole purpose of sexual exploitation.

This is an enormous issue. Many of our colleagues in the Senate have been working on authorizing legislation, and a great deal of it is pending in the Judiciary Committee. We have joined together and asked the Judiciary Com-

mittee to hold a hearing on the major trafficking bills, and we thank Chairman GRASSLEY and Ranking Member LEAHY for holding the hearing, as well as for joining with us in moving legislation.

This is not just a woman's issue; this is a human rights issue. So we have a Klobuchar-Cornyn bill. We have a Collins-Leahy effort. We are all working on this together. But it is we, the women of the Senate, who continue to be a force to make sure we will focus on it within our own government and around the world. We will be looking at what are the most significant efforts we can take.

The numbers are startling and discouraging. Twenty-one million people are trafficked globally every year—21 million people. It is the third largest global crime—right up there with the selling of weapons of mass destruction, and right up there with selling drugs, and drug cartels. In fact, in many instances, it is the same organized crime network. If someone is willing to sell a person and treat them as a commodity, they are willing to sell drugs, they are willing to sell guns, they are willing to sell nuclear fissionable material. They are willing to do anything.

This isn't just about recruiting girls in Asia or girls and women in Central Europe; this is in our own country, where 800,000 people are trafficked each year.

When I met with my FBI agents in Maryland and the U.S. Attorney's Office to discuss this issue, they told me that the I-95 corridor is a corridor for violence and trafficking and that we are a hotspot for trafficking activities, because we have a seaport, we have a major interstate highway, and we have big sporting events. Can my colleagues imagine such activity at sporting events such as the big games? The playoffs that we so enjoy in Baltimore are also part of trafficking.

But we know our local law enforcement and our FBI are on the job. We have programs such as Operation Cross Country. Last year, the FBI helped recover close to 170 children who had been forced into prostitution, with simultaneous raids, and they put 281 pimps in jail.

We are going to take the first step. There are many bills pending where the women of the Senate have really thought about this, worked on this, taken leadership on this, and they will talk about their various legislative initiatives.

As the chair of the Appropriations Committee, I wanted to look at not only the great work my colleagues were doing in authorizing, but what we could do now for the money. Last year, in the 2015 omnibus, with the full concurrence of then-Vice Chairman SHELBY—a really strong advocate on this issue—and then across the aisle with HAL ROGERS in the House, we put \$42 million in the Justice Department to make sure we were fighting trafficking. We included a \$28 million in-

crease for programs that provide grants that are lifesaving, as well as life-rescuing services to victims. These funds were to ensure that law enforcement could enforce the law and make sure victims had emergency shelters and counseling, supporting a true rescue mission.

We also made sure the FBI had additional resources to find those criminals and bring them to justice, and to focus on efforts such as a program called "Innocence Lost" that focuses on the trafficking of children. We funded human trafficking prosecution by adding more money for civil rights attorneys to identify the large trafficking rings to do it.

I don't want to sound like an accountant; I want to sound like one of the women of the Senate who thinks about these women who have been recruited around the world and the children who are being nabbed and grabbed, and the exploitation of lost children, sometimes runaway youths.

We want to say to them that our Federal dollars are working hard, and we are going to look at how authorizers and appropriators really work together. We want to pass some of this new, fresh thinking on how to attack and deal with this problem. We are going to look at the Appropriations Committee across all subcommittees to see what we can do.

The women of the Senate are going to be a voice and a vote on this, and we know we have good men of the Senate who also work with us and support us. So working shoulder to shoulder, we can do something to make it safer for our communities and have a big impact around the world. We will do it because we took the time to listen to each other and figure out ways we can work together. Let's get it done, and let's get it done now.

I would now like to yield time for someone who has been a real leader on this issue, and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who has brought some new, fresh thinking and fresh approaches but also has been wise and prudent for her taxpayers and, I might also add, a former attorney general in the State of Minnesota. She is a great warrior, and she has made sure that she has some new ideas. Senator KLOBUCHAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge Senator MIKULSKI and her leadership. Anyone who wondered how hard she was going to keep working after she announced she wasn't running again for the next year—I think we just saw the answer right here. She hasn't slowed down one bit. She is already here advocating for some incredibly important bills, and I am also glad to see that Senator SHAHEEN and Senator HIRONO are here. They are going to speak shortly.

Given I have been able to talk about this at length on the Committee on the Judiciary, I will be brief and say this:

I have an important bill with Senator CORNYN, and it is a bill, a version of which has already passed the House, a bipartisan bill, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act. Also, Senator CORNYN has a bill with me and a number of other people called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. My bill passed through the Committee on the Judiciary last week after the hearing that Senator MIKULSKI referred to, 20-0, on a vote. And Senator CORNYN's bill, which I have also cosponsored, passed on a near-unanimous vote. Senator LEAHY and Senator COLLINS, as was mentioned by Senator MIKULSKI, have an important bill—the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. We are hopeful we can get these done, along with what Senator FEINSTEIN is doing, and many others, in the coming days on the Senate floor.

I think the first message here is this is bipartisan. I don't think any sex trafficker wants to hear we are doing some tougher stuff to go after them, but we are. It is very important that this be bipartisan.

I give you one example of a case charged last week out of Minnesota. A 12-year-old girl—not even old enough to get a driver's license, not even old enough to go to her first prom—gets a text. She goes to a parking lot at McDonald's. She thinks there is a party. A guy puts her in a car and drives her to Rochester, MN—the Twin Cities—rapes her and then takes pictures of her and puts it on Craigslist. The next day two other men buy her off of Craigslist and rape her.

That happened in Minnesota. That is happening all over the country, where 83 percent of the victims are not from other countries, 83 percent of the victims are from our own country. This is the third biggest criminal enterprise—international criminal enterprise—in the world. Only after illegal drugs and illegal guns comes selling young girls and young boys for sex. This is going on in the oil patch in North Dakota. It is going on in the city streets in Baltimore. It is going on in small towns in Minnesota. That is what we are seeing happening across our country.

I appreciate all the support of my Democratic and Republican colleagues. What this bill does that we passed 20-0 out of the Committee on the Judiciary—the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act—is it takes this model that has been really successful in Minnesota. We just got a 40-year sentence last year against someone running a ring who basically says, are you going to prosecute the 12-year-old? No. That 12-year-old is a victim.

When you start thinking like that and you start thinking of these victims as actual victims, then you give them services. Then they turn their lives around, and then they testify against the guys who are running these rings. That is how you make the cases. If you prosecute them, my guess is they are going to go right back to that pimp who brought them into this world in the first place.

That is why this has been adopted already in 15 States, and 12 States are looking at it. What our bill does is simply takes an existing grant program and creates incentives so that other States will adopt this as well.

We also have the ability for these victims to access programs that help people get jobs.

Finally, the national sex trafficking strategy. We do not have one in this country. That is in this bill as well. You can see why it got widespread support.

I am excited about these bills because finally we are working on something together. I would like to get them done as soon as possible. There are a lot of bills that have passed in the House. We are going to have to coordinate all these efforts, as Senator MIKULSKI said. But this is the moment in time where we can finally say not just to the rest of the world but to girls in our own country that we are going to stand up for them and we are going to stand up against these people running the rings.

Why has this gotten worse in the last few years? We love the Internet, but people are advertising on the Internet. They are getting away with it, and we have to make sure we are sophisticated, more sophisticated than the perpetrators who are committing these crimes.

I see that our great Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN, is here. I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for 1 minute?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I will.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I want to say this is not a Democratic women's issue. We are in this on a bipartisan basis. I want to note that the Democratic women are here because the Republican women are chairing committees and subcommittees. I know the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. AYOTTE, will be on the floor shortly. The distinguished Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, is at a very important Navy appropriations committee hearing. So when my colleagues see us, don't assume it is just Democratic women. It is all of us together. But their responsibility has them at another duty station right this minute. I wanted to explain where we are.

I yield the floor back to Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to echo what my colleagues Senator MIKULSKI and Senator KLOBUCHAR have said about this being a bipartisan issue. This is an issue that affects everybody in this country—Republicans, Democrats, Independents. It is a critical issue for the Senate. It is a critical issue for the House. It is a critical issue for State legislatures across the country.

I am so pleased to be able to join my colleagues and thank Senator MIKUL-

SKI for her leadership for such a long time on this issue and so many others, and commend Senator KLOBUCHAR for everything she is doing to address this issue. I am so pleased to join Senator HIRONO as well this morning, and look forward to seeing my colleague from New Hampshire coming to the floor shortly.

This Sunday, March 8, nations across the globe will observe International Women's Day. It is an annual occasion to celebrate the achievements of women across the globe. But it also recognizes the obstacles that still stand in the way of equal rights and opportunities for women. Over the last century, women have fought for equal rights and opportunities, and we made enormous advances in much of the world. Humanity has learned that women's rights are human rights, and those rights include being respected as full and equal partners in all aspects of the economy and society. We have learned that when women succeed, families succeed, communities succeed, and nations succeed.

However, as my colleagues have pointed out so eloquently, across the globe countless millions of women continue to face not only the denial of basic human and civil rights, but outright violence and bondage. We would like to think of slavery as a thing of the past, particularly here in America. But the tragic reality is that this scourge continues to thrive in the 21st century. We are here this morning to shine a spotlight on the modern slave trade and to encourage all of our colleagues here in the Senate to work with us to end it.

An estimated 27 million people are trapped in the multibillion dollar marketplace that trafficks in slaves. Victims include forced migrant laborers, bonded laborers, and sex slaves, including women forced into marriages as de facto slaves. Tragically, as we have heard, children account for the majority of modern slaves, many of them trafficked and sexually exploited.

Let's be clear. As Senators KLOBUCHAR and MIKULSKI pointed out, modern-day slavery is not confined to impoverished and backward countries. I was recently briefed on a human trafficking case investigated in my home State of New Hampshire. This case involved forced prostitution. Fortunately, three arrests have already been made. The investigation is still ongoing, so I can't talk about the specifics of the case, but fortunately several of the victims have been rescued.

I want to state the obvious and point out what Senator KLOBUCHAR also pointed out: If modern slavery can exist in communities in New Hampshire, in Minnesota, in Maryland, it can exist anywhere in the world.

I am proud the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, led by Chairman CORKER and our Ranking Member MENENDEZ, is spearheading new legislation which I have cosponsored to fight the modern slave trade on a global

scale. Our bill is titled the Ending Modern Slavery Initiative Act of 2015, and it was unanimously reported out of committee last week.

It would authorize the creation of a nonprofit foundation to be known as the End Modern Slavery Initiative Foundation. This new foundation would fund projects to rescue victims of modern slavery and to prevent individuals from being victimized by slavery. In addition, it would pursue the strict enforcement of laws to punish individual and corporate perpetrators of modern slavery.

I want to again commend the work of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary under the leadership of Chairman GRASSLEY and Ranking Member LEAHY, as well as the work that Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR are doing. The Committee on the Judiciary advanced three bipartisan bills to crack down on criminals involved in human trafficking and to assist victims with the rehabilitation.

As we are talking about the prevalence of human trafficking, I think this picture of the areas of human trafficking shows while it is stronger in particular regions of the country—up the I-95 corridor—it is all over the country. The Presiding Officer's home State of Arkansas—a small state like New Hampshire—is one of those States where we see a big red hotspot for human trafficking. We see it all across the country. It is why we need to do everything we can nationally to respond to this scourge.

As we look forward this week to celebrating International Women's Day on Sunday, let us also remember the millions of women who have been left behind, who are being exploited by traffickers and trapped in modern slavery, who are desperate to have their humanity recognized and rescued. I urge all of our colleagues here in the Senate to join us in supporting legislation that will combat and hopefully ultimately end modern slavery, the scourge of human trafficking.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, we also are joined today by Senator HIRONO, who for many years served with me on the Committee on the Judiciary. She is now on the Intelligence Committee, but has been very active in this issue as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and we thank her for being here today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership on this issue as well as on so many other important issues.

I rise today with many of my fellow women Senators from both parties in drawing awareness to the terrible crime of human trafficking, and not just drawing awareness, but to call upon all of us to take action to stop this crime.

According to the International Labour Organization, there are an estimated 21 million victims of trafficking globally, something that Senator MIKULSKI has already mentioned. That is 21 million people. That is more than the total population of 48 States, including Hawaii, who are trafficked every single year. Only Texas and California have more than 21 million people.

The most recent estimates available show that between 14,500 and 17,500 people were trafficked into the United States in 2005. That is why I am working to enhance our ability to protect human trafficking victims seeking refuge in our country. Right now, many families are torn apart at the border because current law requires adult men to be transferred to a border location hundreds of miles away from where they were intercepted.

Meanwhile, their families, who are often with them, are sent back across the border at the place where they were intercepted with no money and no idea of where their husbands or fathers were taken. The situation leaves women and children vulnerable to trafficking, sexual violence, and other dangers.

I have also sought to place independent child welfare professionals at Border Patrol stations to provide basic humanitarian assistance to unaccompanied children held in our border stations. This would ensure appropriate screening of children to identify victims of persecution or trafficking. It also would ensure that children are not held for longer than necessary in U.S. Custom and Border Protection facilities.

At the peak of our attention to the crisis of unaccompanied minors last year, nearly 50,000 children arrived at our Nation's southern border. Much of our attention in this body was paid to dealing with these children once they reached our border. These children from noncontiguous border countries not only deserve protection but are required by U.S. law to receive certain protections.

But what about the children who might not have reached the relative safety of our border stations? Who knows how many fell victim to traffickers? How many were diverted to other places with even less protection than what they might have received in the United States? Throughout the past year, we have heard stories about children and young women who never made it to the Texas border. We know that criminals have taken advantage of this crisis in Central America by enticing families and children who are looking for a way to escape extreme violence.

When I visited the Rio Grande Valley last year, I heard heartbreaking stories from advocates who all too often saw children and young women fall victim to trafficking. Advocates even saw instances where vulnerable girls were preyed upon by criminal traffickers

even after they were released from U.S. Government custody. We must continue working together to protect these young people who are seeking a better life away from the violence of their country.

Domestic trafficking is also an issue. Last year I met with the Hawaii Juvenile Justice State Advisory Council and learned of their important work with police, prosecutors, and other personnel to better identify minors who have been trafficked into prostitution rings. These minors are victims. They are not criminals. Like Hawaii, other States are turning their attention to stopping domestic trafficking.

There are a number of Senate bipartisan bills on domestic trafficking, as mentioned. For example, I joined Senator KLOBUCHAR on her bill, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act. I also joined Senator LEAHY in his Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act to better assist these vulnerable youth in receiving the services they need to return to some sense of normalcy in their lives.

We are working in both the international and domestic arenas to better address, combat, and eliminate human trafficking. This is an issue that crosses country borders. It is certainly an issue that crosses partisan lines. We can find common ground to get something meaningful done in Congress.

I see that I am joined by my colleague from North Dakota. I also saw my colleague from New Hampshire.

I yield my time for the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Hawaii. This is such an incredibly important issue. It is an honor to see my colleague from North Dakota as well. This is a great example of an incredibly important issue that is a bipartisan issue. Unfortunately, human trafficking, sex trafficking—this is something that impacts everyone. This is something that the women of the Senate have been very focused on, but it crosses all party lines. We want to work together to end this modern day slavery. Unfortunately, the funding for this is really supporting criminal syndicates and so many other crimes. It is also supporting terrorism.

So working together, we hope to make meaningful progress to end this slavery that is happening for too many young people in this country who are vulnerable. But let's make no mistake. This happens in every single community in this country. I had the opportunity to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee last week, along with Senators MIKULSKI, COLLINS, and GILLIBRAND, regarding the importance of legislation to fight sex trafficking and ensure, most of all, that we understand that the victims of these horrific, horrific crimes need our support.

We need to ensure that we can get them back on their feet, help them get

the support they need and make sure they can lead productive lives—and hold the traffickers accountable. Those who are participating in trafficking need to understand that we are going to work together to ensure they are held fully accountable and the victims do not get blamed for these crimes.

The Judiciary Committee heard from experts who are dedicated to changing lives and helping victims. Their work is incredibly important. In my State of New Hampshire, the Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, which I had the privilege of working with as attorney general, has done some tremendous work in supporting victims and also in bringing attention to the trafficking in New Hampshire and across this country.

What we know is that sex trafficking is something that is devastating. This is something where we need to work with local, State, and Federal agencies, working together to prevent trafficking, to provide support for those who are vulnerable in the community and are often targeted, whether they are runaways or people who are homeless. But also there are people who come from communities where it is not the homeless who are targeted. Children and women and also boys are targeted for trafficking.

Last week I was encouraged to see that the Senate Judiciary Committee passed two bipartisan pieces of legislation of which I was honored to be a cosponsor: Senator CORNYN's Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act and Senator KLOBUCHAR's Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act. I am pleased to be a cosponsor. I cannot wait for these bills to come to the floor. I hope our leadership makes this a priority because this is such a strong bipartisan issue.

Also last week the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed Senator CORKER's End Modern Slavery Initiative Act, which aims to eliminate modern slavery throughout the world. It is totally unacceptable in this day and age that people are trafficked the way they are. But to mention it again, modern slavery is being used to support terrorism. It is being used to endanger the world as well. So we have to work to end it.

I also recently helped reintroduce the bipartisan Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, which helps prevent sex trafficking. This has been a very useful program in the State of New Hampshire. I see my colleague here from North Dakota. I know she shares with me—having been an attorney general of her State—that we understand that these are horrible crimes that happen in every single community, from my home State of New Hampshire to her home State of North Dakota. We are going to work together to make sure that we can end human trafficking, that we can hold those accountable who are traffickers, and, most of all, that we can support the victims of these horrible crimes.

So with that I would like to turn the floor over for the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from New Hampshire. I think as we begin to have this broader discussion and as we begin to explore the kind of path for other projects such as this one—whether it is domestic violence, whether it is sexual assault and changing outcomes—we know the first obstacle is awareness.

The first thing we need to do is to take these horrible issues, these dark blotches in our society out of the shadows and put them into the light and develop a plan and a strategy that will not only deal appropriately with the law enforcement component of prosecuting and finding appropriate penalties for people who engage in modern day slavery, but also it is important that we look to prevention.

So I want to first take this opportunity to thank the senior Senator from Maryland, BARBARA MIKULSKI, for not only bringing together several of the Senate women today who are coming to the floor to call for action, to stop the scourge of human trafficking but also for her long-term commitment to women and children and society's most vulnerable.

I think we all know that Senator MIKULSKI has stood tall, which for a woman of her stature is always a little tough. She has stood tall for those who have no voice in society and for those who are engaged in some of the most horrible victimizations that we can imagine, which today is the victimization of sexual human trafficking. So as the Senator from New Hampshire has talked about and as a former attorney general of North Dakota, I think I know how difficult it is to shine a light on a problem that most people do not recognize or are, unfortunately, unwilling to admit is a problem.

When we began in the 1990s to talk about a different strategy to combat violence against women and domestic violence, which was an issue that had lurked in the shadows. In fact, for many States that was an issue that was considered a public health issue, not a criminal justice issue. I, along with a number of my women colleagues who were elected attorneys general, along with this body, and most noticeably now, Vice President JOE BIDEN, began to have an ongoing discussion about the Violence Against Women Act and what we needed to do not only to protect victims but to change the dynamic.

I think that as we began to take that problem out of the shadows, as we began to address the concerns of so many women who for years—literally years—had been victimized in their home, in a place that should be the safest place for human beings, we were able to build awareness and change outcomes. There is still a lot of work to do in domestic violence. But we be-

lieve that great strides were made simply because we were willing to point the finger and shine the light and say that this is not acceptable in our society.

I see a lot of similarities in this fight that we are waging today against human trafficking. With the right strategy, the right partners, the right policies and persistence, we are going to turn the tide on human trafficking.

While there continues to be much time and attention focused on intervention and recovery—I think that is rightfully so—and on criminal prosecution, I would like to take my time today to talk about preventing human trafficking in the first place. As the Senator from the State of New Hampshire discussed, the bills that are addressing this—the homeless youth bill—are absolutely critical to being a point of intervention, to prevent children from being on the streets, from being extremely vulnerable to victimization, from being extremely vulnerable to traffickers, and by helping those children off the street, by beginning to address the issues in their home that led them to flee in the first place. I think that is a very important first step to preventing human trafficking and human sex trafficking among minors.

I also think it is important that we learn from the experiences of other places.

Last year I traveled to Mexico City with Senator KLOBUCHAR, who, as we know, has been a fierce advocate and a wonderful partner on this issue, beginning not only with her work in the Senate but her work as the Hennepin County attorney.

I also traveled there with Cindy McCain. I think we would be remiss if we did not raise her voice and her name in this body today. She has been a global leader and a tireless leader, working not only in her State of Arizona but all across the globe. She has stood up to people who say this is not a problem. She has stood up to people who would just as soon sweep this under the rug and forget it is happening. She has been a leader and a champion of not only the people in her State and the women and children of this country but the women and children of the world. I am proud of our association, and I am proud of our friendship and the work we have been able to do together.

When we went to Mexico, we heard from countless government officials and NGOs about the difficulties they face stopping this unspeakable crime.

What I was particularly struck by were the stories of women and children coerced into this life—not forcefully, not being grabbed off the street against their will, but forced and coerced through promises of a better life, promises of someone to love and care for them. Unfortunately, for many of these young girls, these promises are short-lived because these girls and women are quickly pushed into a world of

physical abuse, drug use, and forced sex with hundreds, if not thousands of men. What was once a promise of a better life is a nightmare relived countless times a day as these victims are sold time and time again, their value now strictly as a commodity to be constantly traded over and over again. Imagine the horror of their lives. Imagine the horror of their existence.

How do we prevent this from happening? We must make sure to work with survivors. We must ask survivors to go to communities, to go to vulnerable populations, and tell their stories. The women and children who are most vulnerable and most susceptible need to hear firsthand the tactics used and, most importantly, the reality of following these false promises.

Shortly after returning from Mexico City, I met with Madai Morales Albino from Mexico. She is an amazing survivor of human trafficking. She was sexually exploited for 2 years, and she successfully escaped while being transported from Mexico to New York City. She is now an activist, and she talks about her experience and helps to teach and prevent this crime among the youth. She has become a role model for the younger girls at the shelter where she was cared for in Mexico. She attends national and international forums and workshops as a speaker to talk about her experience and the horror of human trafficking. She is currently studying to become a lawyer so she can continue to help girls who are now trapped in human trafficking.

The strength and courage of this young woman is awe-inspiring, and she is changing outcomes. We need more people like her in the world. We need more of her courage in the world, the courage to tell a story and then the courage to reach out and relive that horror through telling a story every day, the horror that was her existence.

We must also bring hope to the hopeless and love to those who do not feel loved. We can do this through increased educational opportunities, increased job opportunities, providing the necessary social services infrastructure, and working to build a safer, stronger community overall for women and children around the world.

Most importantly, what we should not bring to this is judgment; instead, bring a helping hand, bring an opportunity for a new life. Whether we are talking about the streets of Mexico City, Baltimore, or Indian Country in North Dakota, we can and we must do better. We can start taking action immediately in the Senate. We can directly impact efforts to prevent human trafficking in the United States by providing the resources necessary to work with some of our most vulnerable and most susceptible—our runaway and homeless youth.

I urge the majority leader to bring forward S. 262, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, a bill championed by my great friend Senator LEAHY. We all recognize

that homeless youth are some of if not the most vulnerable and susceptible to trafficking. This is certainly true in North Dakota. It is certainly true in Mexico City. I am certain it is true in every community where runaway and homeless youth exist. This bill would provide much needed resources to this population and would complement other antitrafficking legislation being addressed in the Senate that addresses prevention, intervention, and recovery services to victims.

I also call on the majority leader to act by urging him to also bring S. 166, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, and S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, to the floor for a vote. I have worked tirelessly to push both of those bills since the last Congress. The Judiciary Committee reported two bills out of committee last week with unanimous support, and it is time to bring those bills to the floor for a vote. I believe all three bills should be part of a comprehensive approach to preventing trafficking and supporting victims.

We must do everything we can in our power to stamp out human sex trafficking in our backyard, across the country, and across the world.

With that, I yield the floor to my great friend from the great State of New York, Senator GILLIBRAND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I also rise to speak about human trafficking, and I associate myself with the comments of Senator HEITKAMP.

Human trafficking is a form of modern-day slavery that is alive, active, and must be stopped. Many of the stories we hear from traffic survivors sound more like plots in a horror movie than real life in the United States of America, but these stories are not fiction. Over and over we hear stories about young Americans forced into captivity, about young Americans forced into sexual exploitation, about young Americans who have no freedom to say no to a violent pimp but are still tagged with prostitution charges before they even turn 18. Human trafficking is a crime that rips families apart, breaks down the trust in our communities, and shatters young American lives.

It is long overdue for Congress to pay close attention to this issue, and I commend my fellow female Senators for bringing this issue so boldly to the floor of the Senate.

Today I will talk about what Senator HEITKAMP talked about—the vulnerabilities that led to these young boys and girls becoming trafficked and how vulnerable they remain even after they have managed to escape from their pimps and their captivity.

In small towns and big cities, thousands of Americans are trafficked each year. Every single institution these boys and girls ever relied on simply failed them, failed to protect them. Their families failed to protect them. Their schools failed to protect them.

The foster system they were given to failed to protect them. Our laws are failing to protect them.

Last month alone, in Rochester, NY, the U.S. attorney announced the arrest of seven people on trafficking charges. Their victims were as young as 14 years old. The U.S. attorney said: “The victims in many cases were singled out because they were identified as being vulnerable.”

We have the responsibility in Congress to end these crimes against the most vulnerable among us. We should pass Senator LEAHY’s Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, which would provide real help to runaway youth, who are especially vulnerable to this exploitation. We should support Senator KLOBUCHAR’s Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, which would stop the prosecution of minors who have engaged in commercial sex acts. We should pass Senator CORNYN’s Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which would support programs for survivors of human trafficking and child pornography and ensure that the johns who are buying trafficking victims are actually prosecuted in Federal court.

We need a law that would vacate the criminal convictions of trafficking victims because these girls and boys are not criminals; they are not prostitutes; they are victims who deserve a chance to lead a fulfilling life. I will be introducing an amendment to Senator KLOBUCHAR’s bill that would vacate the criminal convictions of trafficked victims who were forced to break the law while they were trafficked. No victim of human trafficking should have to go through life—even after gaining their freedom from their trafficker—with prostitution charges on their record. We have an obligation to protect the most vulnerable Americans, and this vacatur amendment would help us do just that.

I know that if Congress does its job and does everything it can to help victims of human trafficking, thousands of young women and men in this country will have a chance to live a fulfilling life.

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. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, today is a make-or-break day for millions of Americans who are better off because of the Affordable Care Act. As we speak, the Supreme Court is hearing

oral arguments on a case known as *King v. Burwell* to decide whether Americans have access to health insurance subsidies through their State exchanges or whether opponents of the law—the very same people who continued to push for over 40 votes in the House of Representatives to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act, the same people who shut down this government last year because of their obsession with repealing the law—will win out with a paper-thin legal argument. It would not only be a devastating blow to millions of Americans who are currently receiving subsidies for their insurance, but it would destroy the individual health insurance markets in those States and would represent an incredible power grab by the Supreme Court that would undercut the impartiality of that Court.

At the heart of this case is the Affordable Care Act, both the text and congressional intent. The question is, Did Congress intend to allow all Americans to benefit from affordable quality coverage across this country, whether they are in a State exchange or a Federal exchange?

To answer that question, you don't have to leaf through many pages of the Affordable Care Act; you can stop at the very first title, which is on the very first page. The first section reads: "Title I. Quality, Affordable Health Care for All Americans." All Americans—not some Americans who live in a State that set up an insurance exchange like AccessHealthCT, but all Americans.

Before I go into a little bit of detail on this case, I wish to speak about this little boy. His name is Devin, and I was fortunate to meet with him just this last week. He is 8 years old. This picture is from maybe 1 or 2 years ago during one of his first trips to Washington. He lives with his parents and younger sister in western Connecticut.

Devin is one of about 20,000 people with hemophilia in this country. To stay healthy and to support his active life, which includes baseball, karate, and snowboarding, Devin has to take an injection every other day. The injections cost about \$4,000 per dose, about \$50,000 per month. Despite the challenges his disease presents, Devin was all smiles when we talked about what he liked to do, about school, and about how much you need to walk when you come to the Capitol to lobby, as Devin has the past couple of years.

The benefits of the Affordable Care Act are very clear for Devin and his family. His family will never have to worry about annual or lifetime limits on his health care. He won't have to worry, nor will his parents have to worry about him being denied insurance over the course of his life just because of his condition.

It isn't hyperbole to say that an adverse decision by the Court would be life-threatening for Americans like Devin who rely on these new insurance protections.

Obviously, Devin and his family aren't the only ones to benefit from this law. Just last week HHS released the final report on enrollment and showed that 8.84 million people have signed up for coverage in healthcare.gov States—Federal exchange States. An additional 2.8 million signed up through State-based marketplaces, such as in Connecticut, for a total of 11.6 million people who have private health care insurance because of the Affordable Care Act and its subsidies which are being spread across the country. By the way, add another 10 million people who are on Medicare because of the Affordable Care Act and we see why the uninsurance rate in this country is spiraling downward.

The tax credits the law provided for people making less than 400 percent of poverty are critical to the success of this law because they make coverage affordable. According to an HHS report from earlier this month, nearly 8 in 10 consumers are getting coverage for \$100 or less after these tax credits.

In my home State, we had a goal to enroll 70,000 new individuals through private insurance and Medicaid, and we hit over 200,000. But the good news doesn't stop there. According to a new report since the ACA was passed, 9.4 million people with Medicare saved \$15 billion on prescription drugs, an average of about \$1,600 per beneficiary. For preventive care, there are 39 million people with Medicare and Medicare Advantage who took advantage of at least one preventive service with no cost sharing in 2014. That is why the *Times*, *USA TODAY*, the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and *Politico* are saying the simple message that now, more than ever, Americans understand the Affordable Care Act is working.

Yet despite the fact it is working, opponents of the law are continuing to try to tear it down. So let us be clear about what a negative decision from the Supreme Court would mean. It would mean that anywhere from 8 to 10 million Americans would lose their health care coverage and another 5 million children could lose their coverage as well.

Subsidies are important because the law envisions three interlocking sets of provisions: insurance protections to fix the abuses within our old system, the individual coverage provision to ensure we have a viable risk pool inside insurance, and, finally, tax credits to help people purchase insurance. Subsidies are the glue that holds all of that together.

That is why a victory for the plaintiffs would be devastating for everyone, not just those who receive subsidies in healthcare.gov. The individual markets in these States would fall into a death spiral if this law was overturned. If subsidies disappear, then people can't buy coverage. If they can't buy coverage, then the law says the individual mandate in those States has to disappear. If the individual mandate dis-

appears, then healthy people don't buy coverage and the insurance protections, such as the ban on discrimination against people with preexisting conditions, simply cannot work. The insurance reforms either vanish or rates spike to catastrophic levels for people who decide to get coverage.

Don't take my word for it. The American Hospital Association warns that "many more people will get sick, go bankrupt or die"—or die—if the Court finds for the challengers. The health insurance industry says taking away the tax credits would "create severely dysfunctional insurance markets" in nearly three dozen States.

Frankly, we don't even need to talk about the detrimental effects in these States because this is about congressional intent, and the intent is clear. Sometimes when we try to figure out intent we have trouble because the people who wrote the law aren't here any longer or they have passed away. Well, there are hundreds of people who voted for this law who are still in Congress. All we have to do is ask them. There is not a single person who voted for this law who will tell us they wrote the law in a way that would result in the denial of subsidies to people who are getting health care through the State exchanges.

The plaintiffs say this is a carrot-and-stick approach; that the intention was to deny subsidies to people in States that didn't set up their own exchange as a way to force them to set up their own exchange. Well, there is not a single Member of Congress who voted for the law who says that is how it was designed.

Frankly, we don't even need to get to intent. We don't even need to survey all the people who voted for it. We just have to look at the law itself. The plaintiffs focus on one line that says that subsidies shall go to State exchanges, but they ignore another line in the law that says if States don't establish their own exchange, then the Federal exchange becomes the State exchange. That is just as plainly written as the one line that is the foundation of the case.

But the entire structure of the law relies on States that don't set up their own exchanges getting Federal subsidies. Why would we even set up a Federal exchange if there weren't going to be subsidies associated with it? There would be no customers in the exchange if the intent of the law was to deny subsidies to people who bought into Federal exchanges. We wouldn't even have a Federal exchange.

Second, we would have established the insurance protections in a fundamentally different way. We would have said insurance protections apply to States that set up State exchanges and they do not apply to States that don't establish State exchanges, because again, as I said before, without those subsidies, the insurance protections simply don't work from an actuarial basis.

But that is not how the Affordable Care Act is written. The act says the insurance protections apply nationally, regardless of whether it is a State or Federal exchange. Why is that? Because subsidies were going to flow to a State no matter what kind of exchange they established.

Lastly, when Congress has historically engaged in this kind of carrot-and-stick endeavor with States, we make it totally transparent. We lay out in the statute here is what we expect you to do, and if you don't do it, here are the consequences. We don't hide the consequences to be derived at through a Supreme Court case, as is the stated belief of the petitioners in this case.

Lastly, the plaintiffs say: Well, don't worry about it. If the Supreme Court overturns this, we will just fix it. Congress can just come back and fix that line. Well, Congress isn't fixing anything these days. We can't even keep the Department of Homeland Security open and operating. Republicans have had 6 years to provide an alternative to the Affordable Care Act. We haven't seen anything more than a memo or a press release. If the subsidies disappear, they are not coming back. Congress is not fixing this problem, and 10 million Americans will lose their coverage.

I want to finish by talking about one more story, and this is the story of a woman who lives in Westport, CT. She works as a massage therapist, but since she is self-employed she was uninsured and couldn't provide insurance for herself. Last year, when the Affordable Care Act was implemented, she found out she qualified for coverage in Connecticut and that coverage finally gave her the opportunity to see a doctor. She wrote the President and said:

The cancer has been detected at a very early stage, which, with a 98 percent survival rate, has saved my life. Moreover, the cost of this screening and minor procedure will be far less than the cost of treating a more developed cancer. Thank you, Mr. President, for assuring the passage of this critical legislation. You have profoundly improved the quality of my life.

The facts are clear. The Affordable Care Act is working. The intent of Congress is clear: to provide subsidies to all Americans, no matter their ZIP Code. The language of the bill is clear. That leaves us with one conclusion. If the Supreme Court overturns this portion of the law, it will be a plain and simple political power play. It will usher in a new era in which the Supreme Court becomes just another legislative body. They will be calling the authors of this bill liars and replacing the authors' stated intent with their own political judgment.

For the sake of Devin and Ann and millions of others who would benefit from the Affordable Care Act and for the sake of American democracy, I hope they uphold the law.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I first wish to say to the Senator from Con-

necticut that this Senator agrees with him. It should never come down to this. The whole purpose of that section of the Affordable Care Act is in fact to provide insurance to as many people as we can, especially the 40 million people who for years and years have been going without insurance, and it is doing a pretty good job.

In the second year of expanding the State exchanges or the Federal exchange, as the Senator has described, lo and behold, of the 8 to 9 million nationwide, over 1 million of those 8 to 9 million are in my State of Florida. So I thank the Senator for his courage, his insight, and his clarity and his statement.

IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM

Mr. President, I want to talk about S. 615. It is legislation filed last Friday, and this Senator was 1 of 11 Senators who filed it originally. There were five Republicans and six Democrats, and it was filed by the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

This is legislation giving Congress a say with regard to a potential agreement that would be enacted in the negotiations between the United States, which includes the P5 plus Iran—over preventing Iran from having a nuclear weapon.

This Senator was assured by the Republican sponsors of this bill that the bill would not come up until after the negotiations had concluded on March 24. Obviously, this Senator would not have sponsored legislation that would try to predetermine or nix the negotiations before they had a chance to succeed.

Yesterday or the day before the majority leader filed a rule XIV to bring the process directly to the floor. It is my understanding he is intending to go to that legislation next week, but that still is almost 2 weeks before the negotiations are to conclude.

I want the negotiations to be successful. It is very important to the national security of the United States that Iran not have a nuclear weapon. That is obvious to the national security of Israel as well. Yet we are about to take up legislation that would start talking about the lifting of sanctions before an agreement has even been reached.

Well, this Senator is not going to have any part of that. Therefore, if this legislation is brought up before the negotiations conclude on March 24, this Senator will not support the efforts to proceed to the consideration of the legislation in the Senate.

It is one thing to enter into these matters of considerable national security and try to disrupt them, it is another thing looking at the consequences if these negotiations don't succeed and we can stop Iran from having a nuclear weapon, that one alternative, a very serious alternative, is war, but it is another thing to make representations to a Senator that are not fulfilled, and this Senator doesn't like it one bit.

I conclude by saying there has been a lot of commentary about the Prime

Minister's speech yesterday. This Senator feels like where the Prime Minister was arguing against negotiations that are ongoing before the negotiations are concluded—I don't think that is in the interest of the United States. I don't like that one bit.

This Senator also feels that when a foreign leader comes in front of the Congress—the representatives of the American people—for what to this Senator is obvious political advantage in an election that is to take place in just 2 weeks, I don't think that is right either.

This Senator is one of the strongest supporters of Israel, and this Senator has had the privilege not only of the perspective of Armed Services but also my past service for 6 years on the Intelligence Committee.

I have visited with all of the intelligence apparatus of Israel, and it has been a seamless effort in trying to protect the interests of the United States and Israel with our intelligence apparatus. When partisan politics is injected into this, it is not good, and it is not good for the relationship.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, sadly, today the Republicans are again coming to the Senate floor—not to help the working people who work every day to make our country great—but to silence their voices.

They aren't here to reward the hard-working families that work from paycheck to paycheck just to give their children a better life and the education that they deserve. They aren't here to pass a highway bill that would support millions of jobs.

Instead, they want to hold the highway bill hostage to big polluting Canadian special interests and build the Keystone pipeline which will only create 35 permanent jobs.

They aren't here to raise the minimum wage. They aren't here to expand the child care tax credit. They aren't here to ensure equal pay for equal work. They aren't here to try to make college more affordable for middle-class families. They aren't here to help workers get health care—we know that because right now Republicans are suing to take away health care from more than 8 million Americans.

They certainly aren't here to fix our Nation's broken immigration system. If Republicans were interested in that, they would be supporting the reasonable, commonsense immigration measures proposed by President Obama that will result in indisputable economic gains for our country—raising the Nation's GDP by up to \$90 billion over the next 10 years.

No, the majority in the House and Senate don't have time for any of these measures to help working families—they are too busy pursuing their latest attack on the middle class.

I oppose this resolution because it would impede one of the basic rights of America's workers: to form a union.

If enacted, this resolution would prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from implementing rules to streamline and modernize union election procedures that will ensure union elections are conducted in a more fair and efficient manner.

These employees who work so hard deserve a union elections process that is free from unnecessary delays and wasteful stall tactics.

Let me tell you a little bit about those tactics. This comes from the testimony of someone who represents unions in California.

In 2010 a petition for representation was filed for approximately 45 automobile mechanics. Even though there were well-established NLRB rules that governed the proceedings on a petition for a unit of automobile mechanics, management asked for hearings, extensions, filed objection after objection, until finally, 427 days after the petition was filed, the union was certified.

Corporations are getting the benefits of increased profits and productivity. Why should they be allowed to stall these proceedings? Why do they oppose giving these workers a voice so that they can improve their working conditions and wages?

First, let me tell you what these rules do not do: They do not mandate timetables for elections to occur. Rather, the new rules simply eliminate existing barriers that get in the way of providing both employees and employers with access to a fair election process.

These rules do not prevent employers from discussing their views on unions with workers. What these modest changes will accomplish: The new rules, which will go into effect on April 14, will reduce unnecessary litigation on issues that are not relevant to the outcome of the election. The new rules will modernize the current outdated process. In the past, employers had to send out mail through the post office, which cost time and money. The new rule will allow employers and unions to file forms electronically. It will also allow the use of more modern forms of communication to employees through cell phones and email.

Instead of standing up for workers across the country who are struggling with stagnant wages, Republicans have chosen to challenge these common-sense reforms.

The right to form a union is a right guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act and by the First Amendment of our Constitution.

These modest changes will merely allow workers to exercise that right in a fair and efficient process in order to protect their rights, increase wages, and grow our Nation's middle class.

What is so sad is that this is just the latest attack on the middle class and their economic security. Instead of taking up more floor time going after the rights of workers, let's fight to help working families. Instead of trying to undo measures that help the

middle class, let's fight to do more for them.

At a time when wages are stagnating, instead of trying to silence the voices of hard-working men and women, let's fight to empower them through collective bargaining.

I urge my colleagues to support modernization and oppose this resolution. Let's let our workers know that we hear them, that we support them, and that we will fight to make life better for our middle class families.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the NLRB's current election process has some glaring problems, contrary to what some of my Republican colleagues have claimed.

For one, the process is inefficient. In many cases across the United States, frivolous litigation and needless delays threaten the rights of workers who want to vote on union representation. Federal appellate courts have called union election delays "inexcusable," "deplorable," and "egregious." The new reforms specifically target those systemic inefficiencies and excessive delays.

Secondly, the current system is outdated. Right now, the NLRB, employers, and unions are barred from filing forms electronically during the election process. And it does not allow for the use of modern forms of communication to employees through cell phones and emails. The updates will adapt the election procedures to few forms of technology.

Another problem is the current system is unpredictable. Right now, the election process for one region of the country could be substantially different in another region. That adds to inefficiencies and confusion. The new reforms will provide uniformity and certainty in elections across the country.

There is a clear problem here. The NLRB made modest, but important, changes to modernize and streamline the process.

Mr. President, today, we have heard a lot about the National Labor Relations Board. We have heard about employers delaying workers their right to decide on union representation. We have heard about current election process that is outdated and inefficient. But, really, this debate is about what kind of economy we envision for our country.

I believe that real, long-term economic growth is built from the middle out, not the top down. Our government has a role to play in investing in working families, making sure they have the opportunity to work hard and succeed and offering a hand to those who want to climb the economic ladder and provide a better life for themselves and their families.

Our government and our economy should be working for all families, not only the wealthiest few. Thankfully, we have had the opportunity to put some policies into place over the past few years that have pulled our econ-

omy back from the brink and have started moving it in the right direction.

But we have a whole lot more to do. Over the past few decades, for most workers wages have stayed flat or have fallen over the past five decades. That means that across our country today, too many families are struggling to make ends meet on rock-bottom wages and poor working conditions on the job.

While the middle class's share of America's prosperity is at an all-time low, the biggest corporations have posted record profits. In Congress, we should be working on ways to build an economy that works for all families, not just the wealthiest few.

Unfortunately, once again, instead of sticking up for workers, my Republican colleagues are rushing to the defense of the biggest corporations that have an interest in keeping wages low and denying workers a voice to improve their workplace.

Workers have the right to decide whether they want union representation. To ensure they are able to exercise that right, the National Labor Relations Board helps make sure workers have a free and fair up-or-down vote.

So the NLRB was absolutely right to carry out its mission to review and streamline its election process to bring down these barriers that prevent workers from getting a fair vote. After a rigorous review process, in December of last year the NLRB made reforms to their election process.

These updates will make modest, but important, changes to modernize and streamline the process. They will reduce unnecessary litigation on issues that won't affect the outcome of the election. The new reforms will bring the election process into the 21st century by letting employers and unions file forms electronically. They also will allow the use of more modern forms of communication to employees through cell phones and email. These reforms will simply standardize the election process across regions, which will help all sides know what to expect during the process.

But some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take great offense to these modest changes. Instead of standing for workers across the country who are struggling with stagnant wages and poor working conditions, Republicans have chosen to challenge these common sense reforms with a resolution of disapproval. Instead of talking about how to create jobs and help working families who are struggling with stagnant wages, Republicans would rather roll back workers' rights to gain a voice at the bargaining table.

Let's be clear. This rule is about reducing unnecessary litigation. And using cell phones and email to transmit information in 2015 is just common sense.

By law, workers have the right to join a union so they can have a voice in the workplace. That is not an ambush.

It is their right, as guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act and by the First Amendment of our Constitution. So when workers want to vote on whether to form a union, they are not looking for special treatment. They are simply trying to exercise their basic rights. We as a nation should not turn our backs on empowering workers through collective bargaining, especially because that is the very thing that helped so many workers climb into the middle class.

In Congress, we need to continue to work to expand economic security for more families. That should be our mission to move our country forward. This resolution would simply be a step backward.

Instead of attacking workers who just want a voice in the workplace, I hope my colleagues will reject this resolution. I hope Republicans will join Democrats and work with us to protect workers' rights, increase wages, and grow our Nation's middle class.

I truly hope we can break through the gridlock and work together on policies that create jobs, expand economic security, and generate broad-based economic growth for workers and families—not just the wealthiest few.

Mr. NELSON. 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. JOHNSON. 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. JOHNSON. I yield back all our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate having been expired, the joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Blunt	Capito
Ayotte	Boozman	Cassidy
Barrasso	Burr	Coats

Cochran	Hatch
Collins	Heller
Corker	Hoeben
Cornyn	Inhofe
Cotton	Isakson
Crapo	Johnson
Cruz	Kirk
Daines	Lankford
Enzi	Lee
Ernst	McCain
Fischer	McConnell
Flake	Moran
Gardner	Paul
Graham	Perdue
Grassley	Portman

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Booker	King	Sanders
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schatz
Brown	Leahy	Schumer
Cantwell	Manchin	Shaheen
Cardin	Markey	Stabenow
Carper	McCaskill	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Heinrich	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

Donnelly

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures (published at 79 Fed. Reg. 74308 (December 15, 2014)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the veto message on S. 1, the cloture motion be withdrawn, and at 2:30 p.m. today the Senate vote on the question of overriding the President's veto of S. 1, the Keystone bill, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Is there any way the time could be changed from 2:30 p.m. to 2:20 p.m., otherwise there are four people who may miss their planes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The request is that the vote occur when?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 2:20 p.m. instead of 2:30 p.m.

Mr. MCCONNELL. That is fine.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the vote on the veto override will occur at 2:20 p.m. Senators should be in the Chamber and prepared to vote from

their seats. This will be the last roll-call vote of the week.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT—VETO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the veto message on S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:20 p.m. will be equally divided.

Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the time will be divided equally.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the veto message to accompany S. 1.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if we could have order in the Senate, I wish to open debate on S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Senator CANTWELL will be comanaging this bill, and I thank her very much for her strong leadership.

The vote that is going to occur at 2:20 p.m. is a very important vote.

I rise today to oppose the attempt to override President Obama's veto message of S. 1, the very first bill the Senate majority brought to the floor.

As I look at this bill, it says to me that the only people who are helped by this bill are the big Canadian special oil interests.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the Keystone Pipeline is presented as something that is going really to help this economy and help oil prices. I think the only thing it helps, frankly, are the special interests in Canada—the special big oil interests—which, by the way, will carry the filthiest, dirtiest, tar sands oil into our great Nation.

If we look at the history of the tar sands, we will find that misery follows the tar sands. We still have terrible problems in Michigan and Arkansas because there was a spill of this dirty, filthy oil, and they cannot clean it up because it is so, so difficult to clean.

This is a picture of a tar sands spill in 2013 in Mayflower, AR. That has not been cleaned up because this is tar sands oil. We had a spill in Michigan, and we know that since 2011 they have not been able to clean up that spill. So why would we build a pipeline to bring dirty, filthy oil into our great Nation and our great communities when we know the dangers?

Mr. President, I ask again that there be order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I know Senators have an opportunity to talk to one another, and I appreciate that, but it is hard to make our thoughts come out right when there is so much talking in the Senate.

I thank the Presiding Officer very much.

Here is the deal. Why on Earth would the Republicans make the first bill a bill to help Canadian special oil interests that will bring in tar sands oil and has caused terrible problems for our communities? It is the hardest oil to clean up. Why would they do it, and why would they go against public opinion?

A recent ABC News/Washington Post poll showed that 61 percent of Americans support the President's position on this pipeline, which is: Don't stop the process. Keep it going. Let's see what this does to our people and to our communities.

I spend a lot of time on environmental issues, and I am saying to you that as you look at the environmental laws of our great Nation, we find that they brought such a better quality of life to people. We can turn that around if we decide at this point—there are all of the challenges we face in our communities, such as, the challenges of lung disease, the challenges of heart disease, and the challenges of stroke. That is what happens from the pollution we get from the tar sands oil.

Earlier I said that misery follows tar sands. I met with the Canadian people who live near the tar sands excavation site. They have terrible rates of cancer.

The bottom line is that because of climate change—and we see it all around us. Just the other day we learned a remote Alaskan village has to be relocated due to climate. We know the impact of this dirty tar sands oil on that, and we know what happens when the tar sands pipeline spills. We know all of these things.

I think the President is right by allowing the process to continue. He was very right to veto this bill, and I hope we will have enough votes to sustain his veto.

I yield the floor for my friend Senator CANTWELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues not to override the President's veto of this special-interest piece of legislation.

I wish to thank my colleague from California for her leadership on this issue and for her constant involvement in making sure that national environmental and safety standards are adhered to. She has been a great advocate throughout this process and I very much appreciate her voice as we close the debate about the Keystone Pipeline legislation.

This bill to approve the Keystone Pipeline undermines a well-established process for determining what is in the

national interests. If we override the President's veto, we would be subverting safety and environmental standards that are important to the American people.

I am glad the President vetoed this legislation, and I urge my colleagues not to override the decision. I think the President's veto message said it best:

Through this bill, the United States Congress attempts to circumvent longstanding and proven processes for determining whether or not building and operating a cross-border pipeline serves the national interest.

... And because this act of Congress conflicts with established executive branch procedures and cuts short thorough consideration of issues that could bear on our national interest—including our security, safety, and environment—it has earned my veto.

So the President sums it up pretty much, I think. Why circumvent the process? The people who have been advocates for the pipeline have been circumventing the process all the way through. They circumvented the process by not going through the utility commission in their State, the public utility commission, and instead wrote legislation around that. That legislation has been challenged in court. The rest of it has been an enormous process here in Washington, DC. While the company was negotiating with the State Department, it was also supporting efforts to circumvent that process at the State Department and just get a rubberstamp on their permit, saying "project approved." I think this project, as does every other project in the United States of America, should follow the rules.

While we spent the better part of January considering this legislation, there were other events that transpired. We heard a lot about the routing and that it was a settled matter. Since January, it is worth noting that Nebraska landowners have taken new steps to defend their rights as private property owners. On January 9, 2015, the Nebraska Supreme Court upheld a special carveout of TransCanada to site the Keystone XL Pipeline. They did this even though four judges who addressed the question said this carveout was unconstitutional.

After the setback, several landowners whose property would be seized along the proposed route filed a new suit and hopefully stopped the seizure of their land. Last month—just this past February—two Nebraska district courts have issued temporary injunctions enjoining TransCanada's effort to acquire rights of way to support the Keystone Pipeline by eminent domain. So at this moment here in the Senate, with the vote imminent, the pipeline's route through Nebraska is still in doubt because the new lawsuit challenges the Governor's ability to approve it.

It is also worth noting that South Dakota will hold a new hearing on the proposed route of the pipeline through their State in May. At this time we simply don't know whether South Dakota will make the same decision it did

when it first approved the route 3 years ago. The situation in Nebraska and South Dakota makes it clear that even if this bill were to become law, the Keystone Pipeline will not get built any time soon.

I know my colleagues would like to rush the process, and they will talk about all of the various steps in the process where this project got delayed. But who said building a pipeline through the United States of America by a foreign interest should get "expedited approval" stamped on it from the very beginning? That is what they have done. They have circumvented what is the process in the State, which should have been through the utilities commission, and they have tried to circumvent the process here in the Senate.

So I hope we will not override the President's veto, but give the President of the United States the ability to still consider these national interests of the environment and security.

We had a pretty robust debate here on the Senate floor, and many of the issues that would have been important my colleagues voted to say we shouldn't consider—environmental issues. So I get that on the other side of the aisle, there are people who want to give a pass-go, a speedy permit to this process. I urge my colleagues to not override the President, but allow him to do the homework that is needed on security, on the environment, and on making sure that due process is followed.

I ask my colleagues to not override the President's veto.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came here to speak on another topic, but let me interject in light of the comments from our colleagues from across the aisle on the Keystone XL Pipeline. Everybody says, on a bipartisan basis, We want job-creating legislation. We want to facilitate the creation of new jobs here in America. When it comes to voting, our friends across the aisle seem to be stuck on voting against job-creating legislation, because our State Department has estimated that as many as 42,000 jobs would be created by the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The thing that mystifies me the most about this debate is at last count, we had roughly 2.5 million miles of pipelines crisscrossing America. I have come to the floor before and I have suggested that people might want to do a search on their laptop or on their tablet for oil and gas pipelines, and they will see a map of those pipelines, and it looks like a spaghetti bowl, because they are everywhere. Indeed, we also know this is the most efficient and the safest way to transport natural gas and crude as well.

So I remain mystified by the fact that the President and many in his party seem determined to try to kill what is clearly job-creating, energy-

providing legislation that would be from a friendly source.

THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH TO CONGRESS

Mr. President, turning to the Middle East, yesterday, as we all know, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu delivered what can only be characterized as a powerful and important message about the common threats to the national security of Israel and the United States. Again, only in Washington would a speech such as this be controversial. I think most people would be concerned enough about the subject matter of what he talked about that they would want to hear the insights and information he delivered in that speech. It was a powerful and important message, and really a call to arms for the United States and our allies in Israel against the threat of radical Islam, particularly in the form of Iranian terrorism.

His words reminded me why—as I know many on both sides of the aisle agree—we have no closer Middle Eastern ally than Israel. Unfortunately, his speech also reinforced the belief I have held for many years that we have no bigger adversary in the Middle East than Iran.

The cold, hard truth is that today, more than ever, Iran is a terror-sponsoring theocracy that is actively pursuing a nuclear weapons capability and trying to establish an Iranian axis of power from Tehran to Damascus to Beirut to Gaza. Iran claims a right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes, but its leaders have routinely lied and attempted to deceive inspectors in the past as a matter of standard practice.

Prime Minister Netanyahu also reminded all of us whose memories might have dimmed that over the last 30 years, Iran has engaged in a war by proxy against the United States and our allies. I was reminded by a member of my staff of an article that came out in 2011 in the *National Journal*. The heading of it is: "Record Number of U.S. Troops Killed by Iranian Weapons." It tells the tragic story that June of 2011 was the deadliest month in 2 years for U.S. troops, with 14 killed. These were primarily by Iranian-backed militias using very deadly weapons called explosively formed penetrators that could literally cut through the steel in our humvees and other armored vehicles like a hot knife through butter.

So given this track record that we were reminded of by the Prime Minister yesterday, and just the remainder that I have tried to provide here with this article, do we really believe that Iran would use its nuclear weapons in a way that would not make the world more unstable and less safe? Do we really believe that Iran, were they to get a nuclear weapon, won't give it to the same proxies that have been killing Americans and our allies in the Middle East and around the world, including the Shia militia, Hezbollah, Hamas, or the dictator in Syria, Bashar al-Assad,

who has now killed roughly 200,000 of his own civilians in a civil war, and with almost 13 million people displaced not only internally, within Syria, but in neighboring countries and the like?

So as the P5+1 negotiations involving the United States continue, there remain serious questions about Iran's true nuclear intentions and about whether the deal the Obama administration is eagerly finalizing—whether it will cement Iran's status as a nuclear threshold nation. Based on some of the details we know so far, many of which are being held very close to the vest by the administration and not being made known to Congress, much less the American people, the President's deal would abandon longstanding U.S. policy of preventing a nuclear-armed Iran, period.

I remember when the former Secretary of Defense, Senator Hagel at the time—he became the Secretary of the Department of Defense—when asked about our policy toward Iran, stumbled a little bit in his answer but ultimately said that containment was not our policy. Our policy was to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. But it appears now that the deal that is being negotiated on the President's behalf by Secretary Kerry would abandon that longstanding U.S. policy of preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. Instead, it would opt for a feeble 10-year containment plan. Such an outcome would be both dangerous and unacceptable.

So while I was glad to hear Leader MCCONNELL announce yesterday that the Senate will soon consider bipartisan legislation that would give Congress the authority to approve any agreement that is reached by the administration, that was quickly replaced by confusion when I read that some of my Democratic colleagues, who have shown great courage in urging that Congress have a role in approving any negotiated agreement between Tehran and the White House—now they are suggesting they might filibuster their own bill and the vote we are going to have at 5:30 on Monday.

Yesterday, for example, one of our colleagues who had been a key sponsor of this bipartisan legislation said that he was outraged—outraged—that the Senate would vote on the very bill that bears his name. He indicated his outrage with the Senate not for voting on the substance of the bill, but basically because of the timing. He thought the timing was wrong. In other words, he opposes voting on his own bill because of the Senate procedures and the process. I don't know how we explain that back home. I couldn't sell that to my constituents in Texas, saying, I am a sponsor of this legislation; I think it is important and the right thing to do, but I am going to vote against it because I disagree with the majority leader's timing, or the procedure by which the majority leader is bringing this to a vote and debate in the U.S. Senate. Good luck explaining that to our constituents.

I suspect who is also not concerned with the process are the Israeli Government and the millions of innocent civilians who stared down an Iranian regime bent upon their annihilation every day. I suspect they could care less about the process. What they want to do is to stop Iran from getting the bomb.

So I sincerely hope everyone here who has supported Israel and embraced a policy of blocking Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon will calm down and work together and consider this important piece of legislation. Because as we heard yesterday, again, from Prime Minister Netanyahu, it has profound implications for both our national security as well as the security of our best ally in the Middle East.

Before the Obama administration initiated these misguided negotiations, Congress had created incredible economic pressure on the regime in Tehran through sanctions backed by the threat of military action. It also has helped, frankly, that America is now producing more oil, and the price of oil is now down around \$50 a barrel, more or less. That has put incredible financial pressure on Tehran itself, because they have basically had to finance their terrorist ambitions around the world through these various proxies by use of high oil prices. But we had imposed tremendous sanctions on Tehran, which, of course, the administration is now in the process of rolling back.

I believe an approach of tough sanctions is one we must return to as quickly as possible. The President and some of his friends have suggested it is either this deal or war. That is a false choice. That is not true. It is either this deal or tougher sanctions, sanctions designed along with the credible threat of military action if Tehran continues on its path to get a nuclear weapon that I believe will ultimately have the best chance of success and deter them from getting it.

The concept of good-faith negotiation, though, strikes me as a little implausible when you are dealing with the rogue regime and state-sponsored terrorism. We simply cannot trust the Iranian leadership with nuclear weapons. Yet, sadly, the President seems to be traveling down a path to secure what he views as a legacy foreign policy accomplishment when he should be implementing an Iran policy that would best safeguard America and our allies for years to come.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, protecting the President's veto of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act is about protecting the review process for this project. The President deserves to have all of the input from the different agencies delivered to him so he can make his decision.

Today in the vote that we will be having shortly, we are saying the

President should be able to exercise his prerogative to review the pipeline and to decide whether it is in the national interest to have this pipeline constructed through the United States of America. But we are also protecting his prerogative to decide in the end, because this is a pipeline that should be rejected on its merits.

The pipeline fails the test on job creation. After it is built, it will only have 35 to 40 permanent jobs that the United States will have on its soil. Meanwhile, we should be having a debate about the wind production tax credit because if we extended that, we would keep 30,000 people working permanently here in the United States, as this wind revolution continues to explode. Last year, there were 5,000 megawatts of solar energy installed in the United States. That is like five huge powerplants. This year 7,500 megawatts, at least, of solar are going to be installed in the United States. And next year 10,000 megawatts, at least, in solar are going to be installed. But that tax break is expiring at the end of 2016. You would think there would be an urgency here on the floor of the Senate to debate the wind tax break and the solar tax break which will create upwards of 250,000 jobs in the United States.

We already have 175,000 people working in the solar industry, but there is no urgency to take up wind and solar. But a pipeline from Canada taking the dirtiest oil in the world, tar sands—tar. Think about that, tar. The tar has to be actually melted down so it can be put into a pipeline. It is tar, the dirtiest oil in the world, and then a pipeline like a straw through the United States of America, built right down to Port Arthur, TX

What is so unique about Port Arthur, TX? I will tell you right now. It is a tax-free export zone, and so there is the plan for the Canadians—build a pipeline like a straw through the United States, right down to a tax-free export zone, and then get that oil out of the United States of America.

Why is that? I will tell you right now that the price for oil in the United States is now \$12 less than it is if you can get it out onto the global market. Per barrel, \$12 less. You don't have to go to Harvard Business School to get a degree to put that business plan on a 3-by-5 card. Get it out of the United States, and you will make \$12 a barrel more.

The advocates for the pipeline say that is not going to happen. That is why I made the amendment on the Senate floor. The oil will not be exported. If we are going to take all of the environmental risks, then we should receive the benefits of the oil being here in the United States.

Why is that important? It is important for this reason: We are—the United States is—the largest importer of oil in the world. China does not import as much oil as we do. We are the leader. You might see these ads on television where the American Petroleum

Institute and other oil companies advertise that with regard to what a great job we are doing in producing more oil in the United States. And we are producing more oil in the United States. Let's take note of that. The truth is we are still 5 million barrels a day short. This pipeline will be moving maybe 800,000 barrels of oil from Canada right through the United States, which could reduce our dependence upon imported oil, but it is going through a tax-free export zone. So we know what is going to happen.

Why is that important? It is important because we export young men and women in uniform every single day to the Middle East to protect the ships with oil coming into the United States that we import from Kuwait, from Saudi Arabia, from the other countries around the world. So why would we be exporting oil out of the United States while we are exporting young men and women in uniform out of America who then protect oil coming back in from countries in the Middle East? That makes no sense.

That is what this pipeline is all about. It is all about getting some benefit for the United States. Climate change, big loser. It is the dirtiest oil in the world. The Canadians actually escape paying the tax in the event that there is an oilspill. They don't have to pay into that fund, either, that American oil companies do. And then notwithstanding their ads on television that say they are going to keep the oil in the United States, they bitterly object to any provision being voted here that keeps it in the United States while they run ads on television saying North American energy independence, that is their greatest goal.

You can't have it both ways. Life is not like that. Either your ads are saying what your goal is, North American energy independence, or you are going to export it. But you can't have it both ways, do one thing on television and then another thing in real life and say to the Senate, please don't put any restrictions on our ability to export this oil. That is the challenge for us here.

By the way, one other thing. If we keep the oil here in the United States, that is going to keep a pressure to keep the price of gasoline lower, because the more oil we have here in the United States, the lower the price of gasoline. Every time there is a 1-penny reduction in the price of gasoline, it is \$1 billion that goes into the pocket of consumers in America. One penny equals a billion. So when the price of oil, gasoline, drops 10 cents, that is \$10 billion. When it drops \$1, that is \$100 billion. It is down by \$1. It is down by more than \$1 over where it was this time last year. That is a lot of money that goes as a stimulus into the pockets of Americans who can spend it on other things. But this oil is going out of the country, so the pressure it would keep to help our manufacturers, to help our drivers, is not going to exist. It fails on each one of these items: One, it gets ex-

ported. Two, they don't pay their full taxes, or any at all, to the Oilspill Liability Fund. We don't keep it here to keep the price lower for American drivers. I understand the Canadians want to make the most money by getting out of the open market. That hurts you. That hurts us. That hurts our drivers. That is the challenge.

It fails each one of these tests. It fails on the climate change. It fails on the export test because it goes overseas. It fails on the tax issue. It fails on the process issue of trying to short-circuit the President's prerogative to be able to consider this in a comprehensive sense.

The President has correctly vetoed this bill. The President is standing up for the American taxpayer, for the American consumer, for the environment of the United States. He is asking the right questions. He is doing the right things.

I urge my colleagues here on the Senate floor, within the next hour, to vote to sustain the veto of President Obama on this policy which does not advance the best interests of the United States of America.

I yield back the remainder of 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. MARKEY. 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. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent that all time within the quorum call be divided equally between the two sides.

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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.

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

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

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about human sex trafficking—an issue that plagues the world and our Nation. Today I join my colleagues, Senators CORNYN, WYDEN, KLOBUCHAR, and KING, in supporting legislation to help fight this evil and to stop it from spreading. Sex trafficking is real. It is affecting millions of people around the world. We should not tolerate it, and we cannot turn a blind eye. This modern-day form of slavery has continued to grow in the shadows all around us. It is time to take action.

The scale of this problem is difficult to calculate; yet many estimates, including those from the United Nations and various human rights organizations, show that millions of human

beings are being trafficked every year. Meanwhile, the criminals who force these victims into slavery profit to the tune of \$32 billion annually.

Mr. President, 300,000 children right here in the United States are at risk of becoming victims of this vile practice. Teenagers are the primary targets. These kids are being sold into a life of physical and emotional abuse. Often they are runaways who flee violent households looking for a way out. Women and girls represent a disproportionate amount of those trafficked around the world, but this does affect all of us. The pain and suffering victims experience is hard to describe in words. Simply put, it is evil. We must do more to stop this plague, and our work begins by setting a clear example.

This Sunday we will commemorate International Women's Day. As we celebrate the progress women have made here in the United States and around the world, we must also use this moment to remind ourselves of the work that still needs to be done.

As I mentioned, Senator CORNYN and I, along with several of our colleagues, introduced a new bill to address this issue. This legislation would set up a deficit-neutral fund to support people abused by sex trafficking. Through enhanced reporting and mechanisms that would reduce demand, this bill can serve as the next step in providing care for victims of trafficking and child pornography. Furthermore, Senator CORNYN's bill protects victims in courts by treating the traffickers as violent criminals. By labeling traffickers in this way, convicts can now be detained while they await their judicial proceeding. Funding for the bill comes from increased fines placed on those convicted of trafficking.

While nothing can erase the pain inflicted on these victims, we must do what we can to make a difference. I encourage all of my colleagues to join in this effort and stand against this vile practice.

A number of my colleagues have other bills as well. We should take the time to consider solutions that are offered by all of them. Our government has a responsibility to stand up and to act for those whose voices grow weak in the shadows of this imperfect world. This is our moment to do something. These victims do not have time to wait. We must act now.

I ask unanimous consent that all time spent in quorum calls before the 2:20 vote this afternoon be equally divided.

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

Mrs. FISCHER. I yield the floor and 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. 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.

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

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

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is the 150th anniversary of the second inaugural address of President Abraham Lincoln. Later on this evening there will be an observance in the Rotunda sponsored by the Illinois State Society and the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Foundation to observe this anniversary. My colleague Senator KIRK is scheduled to be there; former Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood; Stephen Lang; and some of the most distinguished Lincoln scholars in America: Dr. Edna Greene Medford, Chief Justice Frank Williams of Rhode Island, and the most prolific Lincoln writer I know, Harold Holzer from New York.

There have been 15,000 books written about Abraham Lincoln. I think Mr. Holzer has written about half of them. He is not only prolific, but he is profound in his observations about this great man's life. He was joined by Edith Holzer, his wife, who stood by him through his Lincoln travails.

Historians disagree on whether the second inaugural address of Abraham Lincoln was his greatest speech or his second greatest. I am in the latter camp. I accord that highest honor to the Gettysburg Address for its brevity as well as its inspiration, but both speeches are immortal.

I am not a Lincoln scholar, but my life as a Springfield attorney, elected Congressman, and Senator from Illinois has taken me to some of the same streets and same buildings that were part of Abraham Lincoln's life.

Although he tried mightily to be elected to the Senate in 1858, Abraham Lincoln fell short. It was in that campaign of 1858 that he debated Stephen Douglas. At the end of the debates and when the votes were cast, Stephen Douglas was the victor in that senatorial contest in Illinois. Of course, the same two men faced off again 2 years later for the Presidency. But that Senate seat, the Douglas seat that was contested in the 1858 election, is the same seat I am honored to hold today in the State of Illinois.

We can feel Abraham Lincoln's presence in this building, particularly near the Senate Chamber. There is a magnificent room off the Senate Chamber known as the President's Room. It is one of the historic rooms in the Capitol.

It was in this room in April of 1862 that President Lincoln signed the bill outlawing slavery in the District of Columbia. It was in this room in 1965 that Dr. Martin Luther King and other leaders watched Lyndon Baines Johnson sign the Voting Rights Act, prohibiting discrimination at the polls—100 years after Lincoln's death. It was in the same room on January 20, 2009, that a newly inaugurated President Barack

Obama signed his first official documents as President of the United States. And it was in this room that Abraham Lincoln worked long into the night before his second inauguration, signing and vetoing bills passed in the final hours of one Congress, before the next Congress was sworn in. Imagine that, Congress leaving important business until the last minute.

President Lincoln was working in the President's Room on March 3, 1865, when he received an urgent message from GEN Ulysses Grant. GEN Robert E. Lee was seeking a peace conference to negotiate an end to the war. Grant asked the President, his Commander in Chief: What should I reply?

After conferring with Secretary of War Stanton and Secretary of State Seward, Lincoln sent word back to General Grant that he was not to meet with Lee "unless it be for the capitulation of General Lee's army."

The following day, in his second inaugural address, March 4, 1865, Lincoln explained more fully why he had refused Lee's request for a negotiated settlement. He said: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

Less than 5 weeks later, General Lee surrendered unconditionally at Appomattox. The cannons would fall silent. After 4 years of horrific death and destruction, the worst war and the most costly war in the history of the United States was over. But the work was not.

President Lincoln told us in his second inaugural address the urgent challenge is not only to win the war, but to win the peace by achieving true reconciliation. Another President could certainly have been vindictive toward the South—that had been the practice of the day and it is what many people wanted in the North—but Lincoln understood that if America remained divided after the hostilities ceased, then the terrible sacrifices of war would have been in vain. So he counseled in that immortal inaugural address: "With malice toward none, charity for all." Let us bind up the wounds here, and not inflict new injuries. That was how the Union would be reunited and persevere.

Six weeks later after this speech, Abraham Lincoln was cut down by an assassin's bullet. He was, in fact, the last casualty of America's war within its own boundaries.

That address, that second inaugural address, remains the second shortest in the Nation's history, only 703 words. Lincoln spoke so briefly that many people were still arriving after he finished. As at Gettysburg, some listeners were mystified by the President's brevity. Few understood the genius of the speech at that moment. Frederick Douglass was an exception. He said to Mr. Lincoln afterwards, "Mr. Lincoln, that was a sacred effort."

In the century and a half since his death, we have made uneven progress in achieving the kind of America Abraham Lincoln believed we could be. A

full century passed before African Americans in the South were guaranteed the most basic right of citizenship, the right to vote.

If President Lincoln were here today, I think he would be happy to see how our Union has survived. I think he would be pleased and astonished to see that America had elected and reelected another lanky lawyer from Illinois, and an African American, to be our President.

I also think he would challenge us. When our government “of the people, by the people, for the people” is under threat from a cabal of secret, special interest money that can buy elections, I think President Lincoln would tell us we have unfinished work to do.

When we neglect to bind up the wounds of war of even one soldier returning from war, and neglect to care for widows and orphans, Lincoln would have reminded us that we have unfinished work to do.

And when the right to vote is under systematic attack in so many States for obvious political reasons, there is still work to do.

When Americans who work long and hard can't earn enough to provide for their families, I think Lincoln would tell us to put our shoulder to the plough and finish the work of creating a genuine opportunity for all Americans.

We can see in the second inaugural and in the Gettysburg Address one reason that Abraham Lincoln remains our greatest President. He shows us that America is capable of constant progress toward our professed creed. We can love our country and be determined to make it better.

TRIBUTE TO BILL BARTHOLOMAY

Mr. President, even by Chicago standards, this has been some winter. From Boston to Birmingham, AL, tens of millions of Americans have been clobbered this winter by record snowfalls. In fact, we are heading for the exits in Washington this afternoon with the threat of another winter storm.

That may be why so many of us are so happy this week is finally here and we can literally count the days until spring training of baseball begins. In cities throughout the Sun Belt, mighty Casey is smiling again. More than Punxsutawney Phil or the sighting of the first robin, spring training for many of us marks the unofficial arrival of spring.

Few people on Earth are happier about the start of the baseball season than Bill Bartholomay, a man who has done so much for the cities of Chicago and Atlanta, for the sport of baseball, and for our Nation.

Bill Bartholomay has achieved more in his one life than many talented people in five. He is phenomenally successful as an entrepreneur, and he has built some of the most successful insurance brokerage firms in the world. Bill has owned a restaurant, a candy company, and a chain of toy stores.

He helped a friend and business partner by the name of Ted Turner transform CNN from an upstart news station to one of the most powerful news organizations in the world.

Bill Bartholomay is more than a successful businessman, he is a principled civic leader and a true philanthropist. On top of all that, he is chairman emeritus of the Atlanta Braves. He is a man who half a century ago, with support from leaders, including the father of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., brought Major League Baseball to America's Deep South. What a life.

In 1962, Bill Bartholomay and a group of investors bought the Milwaukee Braves. The Braves roster then included a lot of great legendary ballplayers. Among them was a young catcher with a rocket for an arm whose mother had to sign his first major league contract because he hadn't reached the age of 21. His name was Joe Torre. But the Braves greatest player then and ever was a man named Henry Aaron, “Hammerin’ Hank.”

In 1966, Bill Bartholomay and his partners moved the Braves from Milwaukee to Atlanta. Here is something that will do your heart good. Go to YouTube and watch the video of that magic night, April 8, 1974, when Hank Aaron broke Babe Ruth's record to become baseball's all-time home-run champ, a record he would hold for 33 years. For anyone under the age of 50, it may be impossible now to fully appreciate what that moment meant.

It was 6 years almost to the day after Dr. King's assassination. For more than a year, as Hank Aaron had closed in on Babe Ruth's fabled record of 714 home runs, he had been cheered by many, but also subjected to ugly racist threats and taunts. There were people who just seethed at the idea that Babe Ruth's immortal record would be broken by a Black baseball player.

Years later, Hank Aaron would acknowledge that the anger and the jeers were on him. They worried Bill Bartholomay too.

So watch that clip on YouTube, April 8, 1974. It was the Braves home opener against the Los Angeles Dodgers. More than 53,000 fans were standing for that great moment—a record crowd.

It is the fourth inning. Henry “Hank” Aaron is up at bat. The count is 1 and 0. And then it happens: Aaron swings and smashes the ball over the center field fence.

The fans roar. Fireworks fill the sky over the stadium. As Aaron rounds the bases, the Dodgers infielders reach out to shake his hand.

He crosses homeplate, surrounded by teammates, his beaming wife, and parents. And standing right next to him was Bill Bartholomay.

It had been a dozen years since Bill and his partners had bought the Braves and 8 years since they moved to Atlanta. Part of their reason for moving the Braves to Atlanta was because Atlanta was working hard in the 1960s to become the leading city of the new

South, a city that would move beyond the old legacy of Jim Crow to a new era.

Leaders, including Dr. King, believed that Major League Baseball could help to create that new Atlanta, and Bill Bartholomay and his partners wanted to be part of that dream. Eight years after he moved the team to Atlanta, there he stood with baseball's new home-run king, a man who had started his career in the old Negro League, who had just broken the most revered record in Major League Baseball and who would become a symbol of immense pride for Atlanta and all of America. That was one of the many great moments for the Braves under Bill Bartholomay.

Since he moved the team to Atlanta in 1966, Bill has witnessed the Braves winning 16 division championships, including a record-setting 14 in a row, 5 National League pennants. And in 1995 the Braves went all the way, winning the World Series.

Bill no longer owns the Braves, but he is still closely connected to the team and has served as the chairman emeritus since 2003. He is an active member of the MLB owners group.

Bill Bartholomay grew up in Illinois in a family where his father and grandfather had made good money in the insurance brokerage business. He was the second of two boys, and he grew up in Winnetka, IL, just outside of Chicago, in a big house. The Bartholomay family were friends with both the Wrigley family, who owned the Chicago Cubs, and the Comiskey family, who owned the White Sox.

As far back as he can remember, Bill loved baseball and so did his mom. They used to go to Cubs games together.

At North Shore Country Day School, his eighth grade phys ed instructor thought Bill loved baseball a little too much. He sent home a report card that said:

Billy is very cooperative in play activities. While his ability is not great, he makes up to a large degree by his enthusiasm and interest. My greatest concern with him is that he seems to borrow much of his ideas of conduct from professional baseball.

That teacher needn't have worried. The lessons of baseball have served Bill Bartholomay very well. They have inspired and shaped his entire amazing life.

One of Bill's favorite sayings is: “Start strong, finish strong and play all nine innings.” Translation: Give it everything you have got—no half measures.

That attitude has enabled Bill to build or even help build a number of powerful insurance brokerage firms, along with other diverse businesses.

In 2003, he became vice chairman of Willis Group Holdings, one of the largest insurance brokers in the world. He increased their presence in Chicago to the point where they became the regional headquarters of what was formerly known as Sears Tower, now

known as the Willis Tower. Today that office anchors Chicago's place as a first-rate place to operate a global company.

Bill is more than a businessman, more than a man of baseball; he is a civic leader as well. In the early 1980s, then-Chicago mayor, the late James Byrne, asked Bill to serve on the park commission, overseeing Chicago's 400 parks. Bill never said no to public service. So even though he had five teen-aged kids and a number of businesses, he said he would serve for 1 year. He ended up serving for 23 years, including many as commission chairman.

All told, three of Chicago's mayors recognized Bill's talents as a bridge builder in Chicago. He made sure the commission focused not only on the wealthy parts of the city but all of the city.

Bill created a charitable foundation and he has helped to make it work and helped millions of others. He is a generous man and he is generous in praise of others.

I wish to give a short story that I read when I was reading a book one day and stumbled on this little episode in Bill's life that really tells a story. It is a story about another baseball legend, a man by the name of Satchel Paige, who may have been the best baseball pitcher ever. He was an American treasure.

He was a star in the Negro Leagues during the Jim Crow era. He later became the first African-American pitcher in the American League and the first Negro League player elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

He played for an astonishing 250 teams in his 40-year career. He used to pitch year around, often on back-to-back days. He hurled exhibition games on his day off. He spent the winter months playing in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Mexico.

In 1968 Satchel Paige was 62 years old, and despite all the time he had played in baseball, he hadn't played long enough to qualify for a pension. He fell 6 months short. So Satchel Paige sent a letter to every Major League Baseball team asking them if they would consider hiring him as a coach, and if they would for 6 months, he would qualify for a pension.

Well, you can guess who replied. It was Bill Bartholomay. Bill Bartholomay, in a real true act of kindness, said: "Baseball would have been guilty of negligence should it not assure this legendary figure a place in the pension plan."

Bill made sure Satchel Paige got his pension. He hired him to be the Braves' pitcher-coach-trainer just long enough for him to meet his pension needs. In case there was any doubt about what he was doing, he assigned Satchel Paige the number 65, the age at which his retirement salary would kick in.

But there was another reason the Braves hired Satchel Paige. That summer—the summer of 1968—riots were raging and cities were burning across

America in the wake of Dr. King's assassination. Bill Bartholomay believed that having a bridge builder such as Satchel Paige might help diffuse tensions in Atlanta, and he was right.

Satchel did that partly by signing autographs and spending time with fans and serving as a good will ambassador. Even though his title was trainer, what Satchel Paige really wanted to do, even at age 62, was pitch. The club didn't care for the idea. They were afraid his eyesight wasn't good enough and a line drive might knock him off the mound, but Satchel insisted. He said he could tell by the crack of the bat where the ball was headed.

In 1969, Satchel Paige pitched a couple of innings in an exhibition game for the Braves' highest level minor league team, the Triple-A Richmond team. So picture this: Satchel Paige on the mound beaming, and who steps up to the plate? Hank Aaron. The best pitcher in baseball history against the best hitter.

Strike one, strike two, and finally Hank Aaron swings hard, gets a piece of the ball and pops out to third. Old Satchel still had it.

In his 1966 Hall of Fame induction speech, Ted Williams urged the inclusion of Negro League players to the Hall of Fame. Satchel Paige was elected as the first Negro League player to be inducted.

Satchel Paige once said: "Ain't no man can avoid being born average, but there ain't no man got to be common."

Bill Bartholomay has led an uncommonly good life as a business leader, as a pioneer in baseball, as a civic leader, as a philanthropist, and as a man who sensed in his lifetime an opportunity to build bridges in America and make us a better nation through the game of baseball and through the integration of that sport. He served the cities of Chicago and Atlanta in an extraordinary way, but he served America as well. He proved his old phys ed instructor from grade school wrong by showing that the rules of baseball are pretty good rules for life after all.

On this day, as we start spring training and a new baseball season, I wish the very best to the very best—Bill Bartholomay.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. 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. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to address the motion to override the President's veto of S. 1, which would force approval of the construction of the Keystone Pipeline to transport tar sands heavy oil from Canada to the gulf coast. We will be having that vote in just a while from now.

My key consideration today is this. What would the impact of this bill be

on global warming? The reason that is the core question I am raising is that already we are seeing extensive damage to our rural resources around the world from our warming planet. We are seeing this in Oregon, and we are seeing, therefore, an impact on our future economic prospects.

To put it very simply, the burning of fossil fuels is damaging our forests, our farming, and our fishing. By many estimates, to contain 2 degrees Celsius, which is almost 4 degrees Fahrenheit, we must transition aggressively and rapidly from burning conventional fossil fuels for energy toward the use of nonfossil renewable energy.

Now, this shift is well within our power. It is well within our technology. But do we have the political will to make this happen? And that test is before us in the vote we are taking today.

Building the Keystone Pipeline opens the faucet to rapid exploitation of massive, new, unconventional reserves called tar sands, and it takes us in exactly the opposite direction from where we need to go. Indeed, the pipeline locks us into utilizing the dirtiest fossil fuels on the planet for a generation, and it accelerates human civilization down the road towards catastrophic climate change. Thus, building this pipeline is a mistake, and there is a lot to be concerned about.

Now, global warming isn't some imaginary scenario 50 years from now about some computer model predicting something bad will happen. No, it is about facts on the ground right now.

The warmest 10 years on record for global average surface temperature have occurred in the last 12 years. And 2014, the calendar year we just passed, was the single warmest year on record. While some Senators may come to this floor and say that it is just an anomaly here or an anomaly there, it is not. The facts are in. When we have 10 of the warmest years on record within the last 12 years, we know something dramatically is happening to the globe.

The average forest fire season is getting longer. Since the 1980s the season has grown 60 to 80 days longer than it was before. That means that with each year passing the fire season is growing by an average of about 2 days, and the number of acres consumed annually by wildfires has doubled to more than 7 million acres. This is an enormous impact, and those fires themselves put additional carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. So we start to see a feedback mechanism that is accelerating us down this road to catastrophic change.

The snowpack is decreasing in our Oregon mountains, the Cascade Mountains, which means smaller and warmer streams, which are certainly not good for trout. But it also means less water for irrigation. We have right now virtually no snow in the Cascades. At this point we should have a substantial snowpack. So the possibility of yet another major drought faces us this coming summer.

We had the worst-ever drought in the Klamath Basin, a large agricultural

basin in southern Oregon, in 2001. We had another devastating drought in 2010—a near worst-ever drought—and another devastating drought in 2013. And here we are this year, with virtually no snowpack to provide irrigation water during the summer. That is a very big deal.

It isn't just farming and forestry. It is also fishing. The carbon dioxide that we are pumping into the air is absorbed through wave action. It becomes carbonic acid. We can envision mankind pouring vast vats of carbonic acids into the ocean, because that is essentially the effect of what we are doing. If you think putting all that acid into the ocean wouldn't be a good idea and would have bad effects, you are right. The ocean has become 30 percent more acidic than it was before the industrial revolution—before we started burning coal and other fossil fuels as a major source of energy—and we can start to see the impact.

At the Whiskey Creek Shellfish Hatchery on the Oregon coast, we have a big problem. The big problem is that the baby oysters are having trouble pulling enough carbon out of the water in order to create their shells because the water is too acidic. That is a little bit like the canary in the coal mine. If the oysters are having trouble, what other shellfish are being affected by the increasing level of acidity?

As humans on our planet, we have the moral responsibility to exercise wise stewardship of our resources—a responsibility to this generation but a profound responsibility to the generations to come.

Now, our youth tend to have a better understanding of this than do the lawmakers who come to the floor of the Senate. Our youth widely rank global warming as a major concern, a major issue they want to see us take on. They will face the challenges that we will leave behind. But here is the problem: If we wait to tackle global warming until—we have pages on the floor—our 15- and 16-year-old pages are in office, when they are in their forties and their fifties, then it will be almost impossible to address this issue because of the feedback loops that are occurring.

I was watching yesterday a time-lapsed series of ice in the Arctic, and I can tell you that essentially, as viewed from North America, there was a swirling mass of ice—and this was over several decades—and that swirling mass became less with every passing year, to where we are halfway to starting to be ice-free in the summer. That is a massive change happening within a single human lifetime which is but a blink in time when you think about the age and course of this planet.

So big changes are occurring, and when those changes occur, we do have additional problems arise. All of that open water in the Arctic absorbs more sunlight. That is what makes the water blue and it becomes warmer; whereas, the ice reflects the sunlight and keeps the water cooler. Therefore, we have a

magnification of the effect of global warming at the poles. This is not a good thing.

So whether we are looking at the impact on our farming or the impact on our forests which are burning or the impact on our oceans and our fisheries which are becoming too acidic, we have a responsibility to address those issues. That means we are going to have to not burn all the fossil fuel that we have been clever enough to find in the crust of the Earth.

It is estimated that we would have to leave four-fifths of the fossil fuels we already have identified that are in the ground. We have to leave it in the ground rather than burn it if we are not going to exceed 2 degrees centigrade in global warming. That is a huge challenge.

That means we cannot proceed to build infrastructure designed to accelerate the extraction of these fossil fuels. The pipeline is exactly that kind of infrastructure.

Now, have no doubt, I love the idea of jobs and construction. That is why I am a huge supporter of the Partnership to Build America Act. The Partnership to Build America Act would create hundreds of thousands of construction jobs over the course of a number of years in America. That is the type of investment in jobs and construction and infrastructure we should make, but we shouldn't be investing infrastructure that is going to do profound damage to our planet. That does not honor the moral responsibility we have to the stewardship of this beautiful blue-green orb that we live on known as this planet Earth.

Let's honor our responsibility and let's not override the veto the President has put on this bill.

Thank you, 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. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent for up to 30 minutes to engage in a colloquy on the Keystone Pipeline approval legislation which was vetoed.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am here to discuss the Keystone Pipeline approval legislation and the President's recent veto as well as our efforts today to override that veto.

I will be joined in the colloquy with my distinguished colleague from South Dakota. Also our colleague on the other side of the aisle from West Virginia will be joining us shortly, as well as the chairman of the energy committee, our colleague from Alaska. I want to make a couple points upfront and then turn to my colleague from South Dakota.

What I have here and have shown before on the Senate floor is the route the Keystone XL Pipeline would take from the oil sands in Hardisty, Alberta, coming down through Montana where we pick up domestic crude. Often people think of it as moving Canadian crude, but it also picks up domestic crude in the Bakken region. Our country likes sweet Bakken crude oil from Montana, and then it takes it on to refineries throughout the country. So that is the project we are talking about.

This chart shows the project itself, and it shows what is going to happen if we don't approve it. You have to understand, this has been going on now for over 6 years. The President has delayed this project for more than 6 years, but if we don't build the pipeline to move our domestic crude in the United States, then Canada will build pipelines to the west coast and that oil will go to China by tanker ship and be refined in China.

Again, we go through all these different discussions, but the reality is the oil will be produced. The question is, Do we want to have that oil here in our country or would we rather see it go to China?

Of course, if it goes to China, then not only does that affect our ability to use the oil in our country because we don't have the infrastructure to move it around safely and cost-effectively, but we also then continue to import oil from the Middle East.

I will run through a couple more of these charts and bring us up-to-date. It is not like we don't have pipelines. When the President takes more than 6 years to make a decision—having such a hard time with this pipeline—it is not that we don't have a few pipelines in the country. We have millions of miles of pipeline. Of course, this is going to be the latest, greatest state of the art with all the safety features—something like 53 different safety features that are required as part of the approval process that, as we say, has been going on for more than 6 years.

The other point I want to make before we go into the latest status is this is the finding of not one, not two, not three, not four, not five reports by the administration, but in fact the Obama administration's State Department has done five environmental impact statements, three draft statements, two final statements—three draft statements and two final environmental impact statements.

Here is what President Obama's report states after studying the environmental impact: "No significant environmental impact" according to the U.S. State Department environmental impact statements as a result of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

So here we are today, after more than 6 years in the "approval process" by the administration.

We passed this legislation with 62 votes in the Senate. It passed through the House with about 270 votes in the

House, a big bipartisan vote for this legislation.

Last Tuesday—last Tuesday we sent it to the President. We sent it to him in the morning and he vetoed it the same day and had it back to us that afternoon. So that was pretty efficient. We sent it to him in the morning and—bang—he has it back here in the afternoon.

His rationale for vetoing the project is he said it cut short his review process. That is right out of his veto message. It cut short his review process. So for somebody who figured out how to veto it in one day who has been studying it for over 6 years—over 6 years—and he vetoed it because we cut his review process short after more than 6 years.

Subsequent to that, the President was asked by the press: Mr. President, if Congress is somehow cutting your process short, when are you going to make a decision? His response to the press—I believe it was last week or earlier this week—he said he is going to make a decision either in a couple weeks or maybe in a couple months but certainly by the end of his term.

My question is this, How can there be any process there? Where is the process? What process are you talking about?

If he delays it for more than 6 years—a situation where TransCanada, a company that has met every single requirement of the law and regulations—they have met all the requirements for more than 6 years. The six States on the route have all approved the project. All six States on the route have approved the project. It wasn't tough; they had 6 years to do it. The American people overwhelmingly support this project in poll after poll, from 65 to 70 percent.

What process is he talking about that was cut short? There is no process there. If you go on for 6 years, where a company has spent millions of dollars, taking 6 years to try to build an \$8 billion project that would help us create energy security in this country, working with our closest friend and ally, Canada, what process is he talking about? When asked: When are you going to make a decision as to your process, he said: I don't know, maybe a few weeks, maybe a few months, by the end of my term, anyway. That is 8 years.

Isn't this a country of laws? How would you or anyone else feel—any company, large or small, anybody who feels if they comply with the law and they do everything they are supposed to do and they do it over and over again and somebody who is elected to office says, yes, you know, I just don't feel like it.

When did we cease to become a country of laws? When did we cease to have a situation where we can rely on the laws and the regulations of this State, whether it is an individual, a family, a community, a company or anything else?

So when we look at a project such as this one, that is a question we have to

ask ourselves, because if it can happen in this situation, can't it happen in any situation? When do we as a Congress step up and say: We pass the laws. We pass the laws and those laws have to be respected and enforced. Isn't that our job? Isn't that our obligation? Isn't that why the people of this country sent us? I believe it is.

It is one thing to say: Well, it is that TransCanada company. They do business in Canada. They do business here. What if it was you? What if it was your company? What if it was 6-plus years of your life? What if it was millions of your dollars? How would you feel about it?

Remember, America is the place people throughout history have come to do business. This is where they come to do business because they can count on our laws and they can count on our regulations and they can count on the fact that if they made the investment, they would be able to do business on a certain, dependable basis. What happened to that? When we lose that, what happens to our economy?

With that, I would like to turn to my good friend from South Dakota. This pipeline will run through his State, creating jobs and millions of tax dollars for his State.

Mr. THUNE. I appreciate the leadership of the Senator from North Dakota on this issue. He has been a fierce advocate for many months in the Senate for the jobs and economic activity, the energy independence, and the positive benefits to our national security in building this pipeline. The most recent development is the frustration with having the President veto a bill that has more than 60 cosponsors in the Senate. This is a broad bipartisan bill. The Senator from North Dakota worked very hard to make it that way. A lot of Members on both sides of the aisle support this pipeline.

What is striking to me about it is some of the misstatements and things that have been said here recently—the President in his veto message and some of the things he said. The Washington Post Fact Checker, as recently as a couple days ago, pointed out that when the President said that this is going to bypass the United States and we are not going to get any benefit from this, not only did they give him one, two, three—he got four Pinocchios from the Washington Post. What that means, folks, is that is a really big whopper to suggest that there is not going to be any benefit to the United States from this.

In fact, they went on to point out in that story that their estimate is that 70 percent of the oil to be refined would be used in this country.

Furthermore, as the Senator from North Dakota pointed out, this is a significant investment, obviously, by people who want to do business in the United States because of our rule of law or rules and certainty that come with that. The production, the oil sands up there in North Dakota is 30

percent owned by Americans. There is a lot of American ownership in this, and Canada is our friend and ally. Instead of getting the same type or quality of oil from a country where we don't have a favorable relationship—Venezuela, for instance—we can get it from Canada, and it can come through this country. The suggestion that it is not going to benefit anybody in this country is completely wrong.

I know the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out before that up to 100,000 barrels of oil a day would be put in here from his State of North Dakota and from Montana—a lot of the light, sweet crude that is so valued—and it would take pressure off the railroads.

Interestingly enough, the Senator from North Dakota pointed out that the administration found no significant environmental impact. Well, think about this. You are now putting this oil on a railcar or a truck, and the studies show that creates 28 to 42 percent more emissions than shipping it in a pipeline. It is going to go some way. It is going to go on a truck, a railcar or a pipeline. If it goes on a railcar or a truck, it will create 28 to 42 percent more emissions than transporting it through a pipeline. From an environmental standpoint, it makes all the sense in the world.

As somebody who represents a border State to North Dakota, we have had our own issues these last couple of years with the rail service and trying to get our agriculture commodities to the marketplace. There is an awful lot of pressure to move oil on rail. If you can move some of that in the pipeline—100,000 barrels a day—it takes a lot of pressure off of the rails and frees up that infrastructure and capacity to move agricultural commodities that are so important to both of our States.

There is a lot of misinformation that has been put out on this particular subject. I hope we can at least have discussions based upon a common set of facts, and most of the facts we are talking about are things that have been put out by the administration.

My State of South Dakota—as the Senator from North Dakota mentioned—would be crossed by this. The estimate by the State Department was that it would create \$100 million in earnings in South Dakota, create 3,000 to 4,000 construction jobs, and generate about \$20 million in property tax revenue.

There is an awful lot of interest in my State in what happens with the economic activity, the jobs, the property tax revenue, and what that could do to support local governments, law enforcement, schools, and those sorts of things—not to mention getting us away from the dependence we have on foreign sources of energy.

Let's be factual in this discussion. This doesn't bypass the United States. This has tremendous economic and positive economic impacts on our country, and we should not forget that. As we debate this here and have an opportunity now to vote on this veto, we

should at least have a set of facts that is consistent with reality.

The Senator from Alaska has been very involved and has been a great leader on this issue.

My colleague from West Virginia is here as well. He has been working very hard to move this project along. It is unfortunate we are where we are. Perhaps we will be a couple of votes short today, but who knows. Maybe some people will come to the right conclusion and help us advance this important project.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his leadership. The Senator from North Dakota pointed out the number of pipelines that already exist in this country. I know the Senator has also pointed out the positive impact—when we get this down and it gets refined in other parts of this country—that a lot of this energy will be used here in the United States. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has made all of those facts abundantly clear on the floor. It is unfortunate that we have not been able to persuade the President, but I still have hope.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the good Senator from South Dakota, and turn to my colleague from West Virginia who has been a champion on this project and other energy projects. As a Governor, he has worked on energy. He understands job creation, and he understands that we can make this country much stronger if we produce energy here at home versus getting it abroad.

I turn to my colleague from the State of West Virginia and thank him for his leadership on this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank the Senator. I very much appreciate this colloquy, which is basically just common sense.

I became a Senator on November 15, 2010, so I have been here a little over 4 years. That is when I was first brought to understand the Keystone project, which was underway at the time and trying to be built. I was asked the question: What do you think? I looked at it very quickly, and I looked at how much oil we buy from other countries around the world. We buy the same type of oil—750,000 barrels of oil a day—from Venezuela. I was thinking that I would rather buy from my friends rather than from my enemies—the people who take the proceeds and the profits from our buying their product and use it against us. I was very clear on that, and I think most West Virginians feel the way I do.

Let's look at the facts. Forty percent of this pipeline has already been built. This is the part we are talking about, which has not been built and which we are producing and would like to build. The capacity from the Bakken—we talked about how 12 percent of the volume from this will be Bakken oil from North America.

We are saying that we are moving and producing our oil, buying from our

best, friendliest neighbor and ally, Canada, and it makes us more secure as a nation. I have heard all of the arguments against it. People have said that we can't do this because basically this oil will come straight down and go out. They make you believe it is going to come down here, get loaded on a tanker, and taken to another country, so that we get no benefit at all. That is what they are telling me.

We had a press conference 2 or 3 weeks ago. We had the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Alberta. Everybody who was there agreed that will not happen, and it can't happen because they need this to refine it. They will be subjected to the same rules and regulations that our Commerce Department puts on oil in America. No crude will be exported unless we change the law. So that prevents that from happening. That is a misnomer.

Next, they said they don't pay 8 percent into the Oilspill Liability Trust Fund in case there is a spill. They agreed to do that. They said: Wait a minute; this will not be built with American steel. Yes, it will be. They agreed to that. Everything we have asked for, they have agreed to.

We can't even get our side of the aisle to agree basically to put it in a piece of legislation to make sure that it will happen. I trust the Canadians. They will do exactly what they said. I would like to codify it by putting it in the bill, and I am working on that.

The politics of what we are dealing with is this. If we can't get four more Democrats on my side to vote with me to repeal and beat the veto the President has, this is coming back. Everybody in this understands the reality of politics. This legislation is coming back in the form of an infrastructure bill or a road bill. It will come back on a bill that we will all vote for, and we will have to spend a lot of time and energy again on this same subject. I have said to do it now. Let's do it now and move on to something that we need to move on to, which will be something of great interest.

I have a hard time reasoning with those who say that this pipeline is not going to make us more secure. We buy 7 million barrels of oil a day. We buy that oil from other countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and even Russia.

If you want to make this country more secure, let's not depend on the foreign oil where they will use resources that will be used against us. The last time I checked, I don't believe Venezuela uses any of the money we give them for their oil to benefit America. I am not convinced that Saudi Arabia uses any of their money to benefit our country or any of these other foreign countries that we buy from.

This is a perfect, commonsense solution. I also think that our good friend from South Dakota talked about the amount of trains. My State just had a tragedy. Thank God there was no loss of life, and by the grace of God, no one

was injured. I can tell you that the amount of transportation on the rail has increased 3,300 percent since 2009. So 3,300 percent more oil is being transported in America by rail. If we can relieve some of that and be safer—as well as environmentally safer—we should do it.

I ask my colleagues to consider this legislation because if we don't do it now, it is going to come back. We have a chance to put it to bed. It makes a lot of common sense as far as jobs.

I will say one more thing about jobs. They talked about jobs. When I was Governor and when the Senator from North Dakota was Governor, we built an awful lot of infrastructure, such as roads and bridges. I never remember creating one permanent job after I built a bridge. There were a lot of good jobs that paid good money during the construction, and all of my contractors were happy. All of my affiliated trades people were happy that they had jobs, but we never expected to create permanent jobs. They were construction jobs. That is what it is.

Why are people saying that we are not creating jobs? This is construction. When it is done, it is done. I don't know why we can't come to grips with that. We do it all day long. We will talk about an infrastructure bill and be tickled to death that we are getting jobs. But when we talk about 20,000 to 40,000 jobs to build this pipeline, I don't understand why it is not something we can all embrace.

I say to all of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, as well as on the other side of the aisle, that we should all support something that makes so much sense to the American people and the working people of America and also for the security of our Nation.

I applaud and support my friend. I co-sponsored this bill. I feel very strongly about it, and I will continue to speak out about it as long as we have to. I hope today is the last time we have to speak about this legislation. I hope we get this veto repealed and move on.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank our colleague from West Virginia for his tremendous leadership. I know that will continue. He is right. If we don't win the battle today, we will win the war because we will find another bill to attach this legislation to. But the thing is that we ought to pass it on its merits, as the Senator so eloquently explained.

I will now turn to the head of the energy committee, somebody who is truly committed to an "all of the above" energy approach and demonstrates that leadership on the "all of the above" approach every day in this body and certainly in her leadership of our energy committee. That is why she speaks on this issue in a way that should have everyone listening to her. Whether she is speaking about fossil fuels, traditional energy or renewables, this is a Senator who has supported all of these and has great creditability on this issue.

I turn to my colleague from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from North Dakota for his leadership. He has been dogged not only as we have advanced this measure through the floor and process but truly over the years.

It has been 6-plus years, or 2,350 days, since the company seeking to build the Keystone XL Pipeline first submitted its cross-border permit application. Even with all this time, the President is incapable of making a final decision.

I thank my colleague from West Virginia, who just spoke. He articulated some of the myths and misconceptions that are out there, and the Senator from South Dakota announced them as well.

When you think about where we are today, with this veto override here in front of us—you have to think about that fact that this is bipartisan energy legislation. The first bill we sent to the President this year is bipartisan and has strong support around the country from an environmental perspective, from an energy security perspective, and from a national security perspective. The Keystone XL Pipeline is what we should endorse. It is wrong and shortsighted that this President has chosen to veto this bipartisan energy initiative.

We have heard on the floor all of the reasons why this proposal is good and sound and rational. It focuses on the energy infrastructure. I think it is also important to remind colleagues that when we had this bill on the floor in January, we had something that we have not had in a long period of time, and that was an open amendment process. We moved 41 different amendments forward to the floor, and some of those amendments actually passed. They became part of this Keystone XL Pipeline legislation.

So in addition to vetoing the infrastructure aspects of this legislation, the President has vetoed a time-sensitive provision that will provide regulatory relief to our water heater manufacturers. He also vetoed multiple provisions to increase the efficiencies of our commercial buildings. He has also vetoed a provision that would improve the energy retrofit assistance that would be available for our schools. He also vetoed what I believe many of us viewed as a very responsible path forward on the Oilspill Liability Trust Fund and our statement asserting that climate change is real.

We made some good progress with this bill. If this vote is not successful, all of that is now off the table. We are not just talking about permitting a piece of pipe, the infrastructure that goes across the border. Keep in mind, folks, we also included some things that this body felt were important to advance, and that has all been vetoed by this President. It was wrong to veto this legislation.

I think it is also important to highlight some of the irony we see with the veto of this legislation coming from

this administration. In effect, the President is making a mockery of the Executive order meant to expedite decisions, as it has been more than 2,350 days since this application was submitted for permit. But there is other irony here, and I wish to take a brief moment to point this out.

Last month the White House released the National Security Strategy for this country. I will quote from this strategy:

The challenges faced by Ukrainian and European dependence on Russian energy supplies puts a spotlight on the need for an expanded view of energy security that recognizes the collective needs of the United States, our allies, and trading partners as well as the importance of competitive energy markets. Therefore, we must promote diversification of energy sources, fuels, and routes, as well as encourage indigenous sources of energy supply. Greater energy security and independence within the Americas is central to these efforts.

Well, Canada is within the Americas.

The President's veto of the Keystone XL Pipeline contradicts his own national security policy. It contradicts his own energy policy that is outlined by the Council of Economic Advisers in their economic report when they say "the extent to which a country's economy is exposed to energy supply risks—specifically, international energy supply disruptions that lead to product unavailability, price shocks, or both.

The President is contradicting himself at every turn, whether it is his Climate Action Plan that he has introduced, vetoing his own—this veto contradicts his own climate policy.

We have an opportunity to boost our economy, to help our allies, to increase our energy security, to be an environmental leader, and to lead on energy. This President's veto denies us that. It is a failure of leadership.

I recommend that all of us on both sides of the aisle come together to override this veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, President Obama had advocated reducing our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. The President has advocated reaffirming the commitment of the United States to its close allies. The President has led us to believe he would work to create American jobs, not veto them. Of course, signing the bipartisan Keystone jobs bill would have advanced all of those priorities, but President Obama chose deep-pocketed special interests over the middle class with his partisan veto of the Keystone jobs bill. It is the kind of thing that puts union workers on edge. I suspect it makes some of our Democratic colleagues uncomfortable too.

But here is the good news: Our Democratic friends don't have to make the same choice the President made. There is a bipartisan jobs coalition right here in the Senate that would love to have their support. We are pro-Keystone jobs, we are pro-Keystone infrastructure, and we are pro-middle class.

If you are interested in jobs and infrastructure and saving your party from an extreme mistake, then join us. Vote with us to override a partisan veto and help the President pursue priorities he has advocated in the past. There is no reason to allow powerful special interests to block the billions this infrastructure project would pour into our economy or the thousands of American jobs Keystone would support. Your vote for common sense can release this special interest stranglehold. It can return a little more sanity to Washington.

There is a lot we can accomplish by working together with serious jobs ideas and commonsense reform as our guiding principle. So I hope you will join the new majority in that effort because no matter what happens today, this new Congress is not going to stop working for good ideas, and we are not going to protect the President from them either.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this bipartisan legislation.

The Prime Minister of Israel was here yesterday and he spoke to Congress. We have an opportunity to declare energy independence. We do not need to rely on oil from the Middle East. I ask my colleagues to join with us and vote yes to override the President's veto of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill (S. 1) pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the Constitution.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Bennet	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Casey	Hoeven	Scott
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Sullivan
Collins	Kirk	Tester
Corker	Lankford	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McCaskill	Warner
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Booker	King	Sanders
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schatz
Brown	Leahy	Schumer
Cantwell	Markey	Shaheen
Cardin	Menendez	Stabenow
Coons	Merkley	Udall
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Nelson	
Heinrich	Peters	

NOT VOTING—1

Donnelly

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 37.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, not having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, fails to pass over the veto of the President of the United States.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, nearly 4 months ago—not 4 weeks ago but 4 months ago—President Obama announced his intention to nominate Loretta Lynch to be our country's next Attorney General. I had the privilege of attending that White House ceremony. In fact, I took this photograph at the ceremony.

But as I took it, I was mostly moved by what Ms. Lynch explained. She said she was excited about the challenge of becoming our Nation's chief law enforcement officer. She noted with obvious admiration that the Department of Justice is the only Cabinet Department named for an ideal. Think of that. The Department of Justice. It is named for the ideal of justice.

We know from Loretta Lynch's long public service career that she aspires to make that ideal a reality. She will when she becomes Attorney General of the United States. As U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, she brought countless terrorists and cyber criminals to justice. She obtained convictions against corrupt public officials from both political parties. She fought tirelessly against violent crime and financial fraud. Her record shows as Attorney General she will effectively, fairly, and independently enforce the law.

As many people have said, she is a prosecutor's prosecutor. Her record of accomplishment goes beyond just that. It goes to who she is as a person. It is bolstered by the faith and values instilled in her by her family. The Judiciary Committee was honored to have her proud father, the Reverend Lorenzo Lynch, with us not only at both days of the historic hearings in January, but also last Thursday as the committee considered his daughter's historic nomination.

When Loretta Lynch was a young child, Reverend Lynch bravely opened his church to students and others to organize lunch counter sit-ins in North Carolina. He taught his only daughter that "ideals are wonderful things, but unless you can share them with others and make this world a better place, they are just words." Every one of us who has ever been in public service ought to listen to that. The fact that she has dedicated the majority of her career to public service reaffirms that she has lived those ideals of justice in the service of others.

Last week, the committee reported her nomination favorably with a bipartisan vote. I wish the vote had been unanimous. I suspect that if the President who nominated her had been a Republican, she would have been confirmed by now. But in the sixth year of this administration, perhaps there is no one who can be confirmed unanimously, because those Republicans who are opposing Ms. Lynch are not doing so based on her record. They are opposing her because they disagree with a decision that President Obama made and that she played no part in. That is not treating her fairly.

One need only look at her supporters to know how nonpartisan her nomination really is. Louis Freeh, the former Director of the FBI and a Federal judge, has written:

[I]n my twenty-five years of public service—23 in the Department of Justice—I cannot think of a more qualified nominee to be America's chief law enforcement officer.

I know Judge Freeh very well. He is a man of total integrity. He would not say this unless he strongly believed it.

The current New York Police Commissioner, who was appointed by a Democrat, and a former New York Police Commissioner, appointed by a Republican, both strongly support her nomination.

Even prominent Fox News hosts have praised Loretta Lynch's work as a prosecutor. Bill O'Reilly has called her a hero for her prosecution of a child rapist. Megyn Kelly, of Fox, has described Ms. Lynch as a "straight shooter" for her service as a Federal prosecutor, especially for her crackdown on gang crime and terrorism.

Ms. Lynch also has broad support from law enforcement, fellow prosecutors, civil rights groups, and numerous other prominent individuals.

I ask unanimous consent to have a list of letters in support of her nomination printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Nobody else is seeking the floor. I ask unanimous consent to go beyond the 10 minutes allotted, up to 3 extra minutes.

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

Mr. LEAHY. In January, Ms. Lynch testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee for nearly 8 hours. She has now responded to nearly 900 questions for the record. I have been here 40 years and I have a hard time remembering somebody who has answered so many questions. The witnesses invited by Republicans to speak on this, not a single one of them actually opposed her nomination. In fact, I asked all of the outside witnesses: If anybody here opposes her nomination, would you please raise your hand. Nobody did.

Despite this, some voted no—some Republican Senators voted no on her nomination in committee. Some of these Senators opposed her because she would not renounce the President's Executive action to keep immigrant families together. They are attacking her for this. They blame this on her. But they fail to acknowledge that if the Republican leadership in the House had just allowed a vote on the immigration reform that passed the Senate, then the President would not have been compelled to act.

Very hard-working Republicans and Democrats came together in this body to pass by a 2-to-1 margin an immigration bill. Most people felt it would pass the House of Representatives had it been allowed to come to a vote. But the Speaker determined not to let it come to a vote. You cannot then say: We are not going to vote on anything, but, oh, by the way, we are not going to let the President do what Presidents have always done in the absence of legislation, take executive action.

Now we all agree that we have problems in our immigration system. We all agree that we need legislation to fix it. The President is not going to do that. Congress has to do it. We have to stand up and vote for or against changes. But to blame the Attorney General nominee for this is simply unfair. To blame her because the House of Representatives will not vote on immigration is not fair. Ms. Lynch played no part in the President's decision to set the prosecutorial priorities of the administration.

As a Federal prosecutor in New York, no one has claimed that Ms. Lynch has failed to enforce the law. There is no legitimate reason to delay her vote any longer. In fact, there are a whole lot of people in prison today who wish that she had not enforced the law. But if they were guilty of crimes, she enforced it, whether Republicans, Democrats—no matter who they were—and with quite a few terrorists—she enforced the law. She put them in prison.

So we should examine Loretta Lynch's nomination based on her

record, her accomplishments, her extraordinary character. I call on the Republican Leader to schedule an immediate vote on Loretta Lynch's confirmation. Vote yes or vote no. But this confirmation has been pending for 116 days—116 days. We have had several breaks—some of our constituents call them vacations—during that time. Let's take a day or so and vote on her.

Let's not deprive the American people of even one more day of having Loretta Lynch as their Attorney General. Let's vote to confirm this superb woman, this superb nominee for Attorney General, this nominee who believes that justice is an ideal, that all of us, no matter what our political party, should ascribe to.

I told her father how moved I was to watch his pride as she was before our committee for confirmation, I said, the pride was well earned because of the example he set to her as a child, to face up to all obstacles and overcome them. Well, let's not have the Senate set an obstacle that she cannot overcome. Let's have a vote. Let's put her in there as Attorney General, for the good of the country, not of any political party, but for the good of the country.

This is not the Attorney General of the President. This is not the Attorney General of the Members of this body. This is the Attorney General of the United States. It is the Attorney General for 300 million Americans. Let's give 300 million Americans the Attorney General they deserve.

I yield the floor.

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

LETTERS RECEIVED IN SUPPORT OF LORETTA LYNCH'S ATTORNEY GENERAL NOMINATION
CURRENT & FORMER ELECTED OFFICIALS

The Honorable John Lewis (GA-5); The Honorable Kathleen Rice (NY-4), former District Attorney for Nassau County; Durham County, NC, Board of Commissioners; Martin County, NC, Board of Commissioners; John Sexton, President of New York University, Former Chairman of the New York Federal Reserve; The Honorable Marcia Fudge (OH-11)

Two letters from the 46 members of the Congressional Black Caucus: The Honorable Alma Adams (NC-12); The Honorable Karen Bass (CA-37); The Honorable Joyce Beatty (OH-03); The Honorable Sanford D. Bishop, Jr. (GA-02); The Honorable Cory Booker (D-NJ); The Honorable Corrine Brown (FL-05); The Honorable G.K. Butterfield (NC-01); The Honorable André Carson (IN-07); The Honorable Yvette D. Clarke (NY-09); The Honorable Wm. Lacy Clay (MO-01); The Honorable Emanuel Cleaver, II (MO-05); The Honorable James E. Clyburn (SC-06); The Honorable Bonnie Watson Coleman (NJ-12); The Honorable John Conyers, Jr. (MI-13); The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings (MD-07); The Honorable Danny K. Davis (IL-07); The Honorable Donna F. Edwards (MD-04); The Honorable Keith Ellison (MN-05); The Honorable Chaka Fattah (PA-02); The Honorable Marcia L. Fudge (OH-11); The Honorable Al Green (TX-09); The Honorable Alcee L. Hastings (FL-20); The Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee (TX-18); The Honorable Hakeem Jeffries (NY-08); The Honorable Eddie Bernice Johnson (TX-30); The Honorable Hank Johnson (GA-04); The Honorable Robin Kelly (IL-02);

The Honorable Brenda Lawrence (MI-14); The Honorable Barbara Lee (CA-13); The Honorable John Lewis (GA-05); The Honorable Mia Love (UT-04); The Honorable Gregory W. Meeks (NY-06); The Honorable Gwen Moore (WI-04); The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton (DC); The Honorable Donald M. Payne, Jr. (NJ-10); The Honorable Stacey Plaskett (VI); The Honorable Charles B. Rangel (NY-13); The Honorable Cedric Richmond (LA-02); The Honorable Bobby L. Rush (IL-01); The Honorable David Scott (GA-13); The Honorable Robert C. "Bobby" Scott (VA-03); The Honorable Terri A. Sewell (AL-07); The Honorable Bennie Thompson (MS-02); The Honorable Marc Veasey (TX-33); The Honorable Maxine Waters (CA-43); The Honorable Fredrica Wilson (FL-24)

CURRENT & FORMER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

Louis Freeh, former FBI Director, Chairman Emeritus of Pepper Hamilton; William Bratton, Police Commissioner of New York City; Kevin O'Connor, former Associate Attorney General at the U.S. DOJ in the Bush administration, current VP of Global Ethics and Compliance for United Technologies; Joseph Guccione, former U.S. Marshal for SDNY and current Managing Director for FGIS; John Gilbride, former Special Agent for DEA's NY Office and current Global Head of Financial Intelligence for Morgan Stanley; Larry Thompson, Former VP of Government Affairs and General Counsel of PepsiCo, Deputy U.S. Attorney General, and U.S. Attorney for Georgia; Jamie Gorelick, Former Deputy U.S. Attorney General; Bart Schwartz, Chairman of Guidepoint Solutions and former Chief of the Criminal Division for the SDNY United States Attorney's office; Brian Parr, Chief Security Officer of Citigroup and former Special Agent in Charge of the United States Secret Service, New York Field Office.

4 Former EDNY U.S. Attorneys: Andrew J. Maloney; Zachary W. Carter; Alan Vinegrad; Benton Campbell; 13 Former EDNY Assistant U.S. Attorneys: Stanley N. Alpert; Jodi L. Avergun; Robert L. Begleiter; Jason Brown; Eric O. Corngold; Matthew E. Fishbein; J. Christopher Jensen; Katya Jestin; Gregory J. O'Connell; Patricia A. Pileggi; David A. Pitofsky; Lauren J. Resnick; George A. Stamboulidis.

25 Former U.S. Attorneys from both Republican and Democratic administrations: David B. Barlow, United States Attorney, D. UT (2011-2014); Wayne A. Budd, United States Attorney, D. MA (1989-1992); Mark T. Calloway, United States Attorney, W.D. NC (1994-2001); Paul K. Charlton, United States Attorney, D. AZ (2001-2007); Paul E. Coggins, United States Attorney, N.D. TX (1993-2001); Robert C. Corrente, United States Attorney, D. RI (2004-2009); E. Bart Daniel, United States Attorney, D. SC (1989-1992); Richard H. Deane, Jr., United States Attorney, N.D. GA (1998-2001); Patrick J. Fitzgerald, United States Attorney, N.D. IL (2001-2012); Thomas B. Hefelfinger, United States Attorney, D. MN (2001-2006); Walter C. Holton, United States Attorney, M.D. NC (1994-2001); G. Douglas Jones, United States Attorney, N.D. AL (1997-2001); Scott R. Lassar, United States Attorney, N.D. IL (1997-2001); Matthew D. Orwig, United States Attorney, E.D. TX (2001-2007); Deborah Rhodes, United States Attorney, S.D. AL (2005-2009); Jose de Jesus Rivera, United States Attorney, D. AZ (1998-2001); Richard B. Roper, United States Attorney, N.D. TX (2004-2009); Richard A. Rossman, United States Attorney, E.D. MI (1980-1981); Jack W. Selden, United States Attorney, N.D. AL (1992-1993); Donald K. Stern, United States Attorney, D. MA (1993-2001); Charles J. Stevens, United States Attorney, E.D. CA (1993-1997); Jeffrey A. Tay-

lor, United States Attorney, D. DC (2006-2009); Gregory A. Vega, United States Attorney, S.D. CA (1999-2001); Kenneth L. Wainstein, United States Attorney, D. DC (2004-2006); Joseph D. Whitley, United States Attorney, N.D. GA (1990-1993), M.D. GA (1981-1986).

LAW ENFORCEMENT & CRIMINAL JUSTICE ORGANIZATIONS

National District Attorneys Association (NDA); National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE); Major Cities Chief's Association (MCCA); Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association; National Black Prosecutors Association; Women in Law Empowerment Forum; Association of Prosecuting Attorneys; FBI Agents Association; Women in Federal Law Enforcement (WIFLE); International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP).

CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS

Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; National Urban League; National Women's Law Center; YWCA; Alliance for Justice; People for the American Way; NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund, Inc.; National Immigration Law Center (NILC); Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Human Rights Campaign; American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO); Legal Momentum; Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund.

OTHERS

14 Former Presidents of the New York City Bar Association: Michael A. Cardozo; Michael A. Cooper; Louis A. Craco, Sr.; Evan A. Davis; Carey R. Dunne; John D. Feerick; Conrad K. Harper; Patricia M. Hynes; The Honorable Barry Kamins; Robert M. Kaufman; Bettina B. Plevan; The Honorable E. Leo Milonas; Barbara Paul Robinson; Samuel W. Seymour.

13 Current and Former Presidents of the Federal Bar Council: Robert J. Anello (2012-2014); Robert J. Giuffra, Jr. (2008-2010); Bernard W. Nussbaum (1990-1992); Joan G. Wexler (2004-2006); Mark C. Zauderer (2006-2008); Steven M. Edwards (1998-2000); Vilia B. Hayes (2014-Present); Bettina B. Plevan (1996-1998); Frank H. Wohl (2010-2012); Robert B. Fiske, Jr. (1982-1984); John J. Kenney (1994-1996); The Honorable Gerald Walpin (2002-2004); George B. Yankwitz (1992-1994).

44 Partners at Hogan Lovells: Stephen J. Immelt, CEO; J. Warren Gorrell, Jr., CEO Emeritus; Dennis H. Tracey, Head of U.S. Litigation; Stuart M. Altman; Robert B. Buehler; Ty Cobb; Steven M. Edwards; Scott Friedman; David J. Hensler; Robert F. Leibenluft; Sanford Litvack; Janet L. McDavid; Joseph R. Rackman; George A. Salter; Michael J. Shepard; Peter S. Spivack; Mark J. Weinstein; Peter R. Bisio; Claudette M. Christian; Robert B. Duncan; Ira M. Feinberg; Mark D. Gately; Craig A. Hoover; Adam K. Levin; Eric J. Lobenfeld; Martin Michaelson; Barbara M. Roth; Lee Samuelson; Ira S. Sheinfeld; Catherine E. Stetson; David F. Wertheimer; Stanley J. Brown; Arlene L. Chow; David Dunn; Amy Bowerman Freed; Maureen A. Hanlon; Mitch Lazris; Carol A. Licko; Mitchell R. Lubart; Peter J. Pettibone; Corey W. Roush; Allison J. Schoenthal; Frank T. Spano; Michael C. Theis.

11 Former Presidents of the New York County Lawyers' Association (NYCLA): Arthur Norman Field (1990-1992); Klaus Eppler (1995-1996); John J. Kenney (1996-1997); Rosalind S. Fink (1997-1998); Stephen D. Hoffman (1998-2000); Craig A. Landy (2000-2002); Catherine A. Christian (2007-2008); Ann B. Lesk (2008-2010); James B. Kobak Jr. (2010-2011); Stewart D. Aaron (2011-2013); Barbara Moses (2013-2014).

28 African American AmLaw partners and Fortune 500 general counsels: Benjamin F. Wilson, Managing Principal, Beveridge & Diamond, P.C.; John E. Page, Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary, Golden State Foods Corporation; Frederick R. Nance, Partner, Squire Patton Boggs LLP; Kevin J. Armstrong, General Counsel, DST Brokerage Solutions LLC; Anthony T. Pierce, D.C. Managing Partner, Akin Gump Stauss Hauer & Feld LLP; April Miller Boise, Vice President, General Counsel & Corp. Secretary, Veyance Technologies, Inc.; Kwamina Thomas Williford, Partner, Holland & Knight; Michael Parham, Sr. Vice President and General Counsel, RealNetworks, Inc.; Grace E. Speights, D.C. Co-Managing Partner, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP; Gail D. Hasbrouck, SVP, General Counsel & Corporate Secretary, Advocate Health Care; John W. Daniels, Jr., Chairman Emeritus, Quarles & Brady LLP; Christopher P. Reynolds, General Counsel and Chief Legal Officer, Toyota North America; Ava E. Lias-Booker, Baltimore Managing Partner, McGuire Woods; Kevin J. Armstrong, General Counsel, DST Brokerage Solutions LLC; Dave Carothers, Managing Partner, Carothers DiSante & Freudenberg LLP; Phillip G. Hampton, II, D.C. Administrative Partner, Haynes and Boone, LLP; Maurice A. Watson, Chairman, Husch Blackwell LLP; Dennis Archer, Chairman Emeritus, Dickinson Wright, PLLC; Erek L. Barron, Counsel, Whiteford Taylor & Preston; W. Anthony Jenkins, Member, Dickinson Wright, PLLC; Frank P. Scruggs, Partner, Berger Singerman LLP; Paul W. Sweeney, L.A. Administrative Partner, K&L Gates; Paul Lancaster Adams, Partner, Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart; Sherrie L. Farrell, Member, Dykema; Richard H. Deane, Jr., Atlanta Partner-in-Charge, Jones Day; Bernard Gugar, SVP & General Counsel, Harpo, Inc.; Damario Solomon-Simmons, Managing Partner, SolomonSimmonsSharrock & Associates; Steven Wright, Boston Executive Partner, Holland & Knight.

Audrey Strauss, EVP and Chief Legal Officer for ALCOA; Sara Moss, EVP and General Counsel for Estee Lauder Companies; National Conference of Women's Bar Associations; Women's Bar Association of DC; National Bar Association; Peter Walsh, Senior Deputy General Counsel for UnitedHealth Group; National Association of Women Lawyers; Constance Patillo; Frank Brown, Dean Emeritus at UNC-Chapel Hill; Tyrone Dash, Deacon at White Rock Baptist Church; National Association of Social Workers.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

KING V. BURWELL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a tremendously important case that was heard this morning in the Supreme Court. The case is King v. Burwell, and it involves the administration of ObamaCare. I was privileged to attend the argument.

The King case is important for a number of reasons. It is important because it involves a fundamental compo-

nent of ObamaCare, and it is important because of its significant implications for the rule of law.

From the early days of the Republic, a core component of our constitutional character has been the idea that the government is a government of laws and not of men. That means our leaders are constrained by the words of the laws in our statutes and in our Constitution. Government officials must follow the law even when their personal preferences would lead them in a different direction.

The current administration, however, is engaged in a sustained assault on the rule of law. I have spoken many times on the Senate floor about the President's disturbing disregard for the separation of powers and other limits on his authority. His offenses run the gamut of releasing Guantanamo detainees without first notifying Congress, to claiming that congressional inaction somehow clothes him with legislative-like authority to suspend immigration laws, to arrogating to himself the power to determine when Congress is in session. President Obama's actions in the King case are of a piece with the other Executive overreaches.

First some background. ObamaCare requires every person in America to buy health insurance. This is the so-called individual mandate the Supreme Court controversially upheld 3 years ago.

Most Americans receive health insurance through their employer, which pays a large part of the premium, but not all do. Many must purchase insurance on their own. And to ensure that such individuals are able to comply with the individual mandate, ObamaCare directs States to create health care exchanges—government-operated Web sites where consumers can go to compare and choose insurance plans. ObamaCare also provides subsidies for individuals who purchase insurance through these State-run exchanges.

Remember that most people receive health insurance through their employer and that their employer pays part of the premium. Individuals who purchase insurance on their own through exchanges, however, don't receive this employer subsidy, so they themselves must contribute more toward the premium. ObamaCare provides subsidies to these individuals to help offset the cost of insurance.

With that background, let me turn now to the legal issue in King. As I have described, ObamaCare directs States to establish health care exchanges. To be precise, the law says that "each State shall, not later than January 1, 2014, establish an [exchange]" that meets certain conditions set forth in the law. But there is a wrinkle: The Constitution does not permit the Federal Government to order States to do things. This is called the anticommandeering principle and is well established in Supreme Court case

law. What the Federal Government can do, however, is incentivize States to act, and that is precisely what Congress attempted to do with ObamaCare.

Here is how the incentive works. Another provision of ObamaCare—the one at the heart of King—conditions the aforementioned subsidies on an individual's enrollment in a State-run exchange. According to this provision, a subscriber is eligible for a subsidy for each month she is covered by a plan that she "enrolled in through an Exchange established by the State." The text of this provision could not be more clear. If an individual enrolls in a plan through an exchange established by the State, she gets a subsidy; if she enrolls in any other plan, no subsidy.

The incentive for States to act also could not be more clear. If a State fails to establish an exchange, its citizens lose out on millions of dollars. ObamaCare's proponents quite reasonably thought this would lead States to set up exchanges and would thus accomplish the same result—the creation of State-run exchanges—that Congress could not achieve through a direct command. In fact, I actually heard arguments by administration people that if they put enough pressure on the States, the States would do this.

Congress also recognized, however, that some States might not take the deal; thus, it provided a backstop. In yet another provision of ObamaCare, Congress instructed that if a State does not set up an exchange by the January 2014 deadline, the Department of Health and Human Services shall "establish and operate such Exchange within the State."

Crucially, however, Congress did not similarly provide that subsidies would be available to subscribers enrolling through a federally established exchange, and the reason is obvious: If subsidies were available under both State and Federal exchanges, States would not have any incentive to create their own exchanges because the subsidies would come either way. Fewer States would create exchanges, meaning the Federal Government would have to step in and create more exchanges of its own.

The restriction of subsidies to State-established exchanges was thus a key element of ObamaCare's entire cooperative federalism scheme. Without this restriction, the end result would have been a federally run health care market—a result unacceptable to several key ObamaCare supporters whose votes were essential to passage of the bill.

Now we come to President Obama's act of overreach. Notwithstanding the unmistakably clear text of the statute, which limits subsidies to plans purchased through State-established exchanges, and notwithstanding that this limitation was absolutely fundamental to accomplishing Congress's purpose of incentivizing States to establish exchanges, the President decided he would also offer subsidies for plans purchased through federally established exchanges.

President Obama's open defiance of clear statutory text and utter disregard for the balance Congress struck is an affront to the separation of powers and to the rule of law. The President and his enablers argue that subsidies for federally enrolled plans are necessary to accomplish ObamaCare's overall purpose of reducing costs and improving health care access. Without subsidies to individuals in the 34 States without State-run exchanges, the President argues that residents of those States will be hit with higher costs and unaffordable health care. The law must be rewritten, he says, to avoid the consequences the law itself imposes.

Laying aside the fact that the Constitution gives Congress, not the President, the power to amend laws, the President's argument is completely circuitous. The reason 34 States could afford not to establish exchanges is because the President said he was going to pay subsidies regardless of whether a State establishes an exchange. Why would a State go to the trouble and expense of creating an exchange if the end result is the same?

The President also grasps at exceedingly thin straws. Because the backstop provision instructs that if a State does not establish an exchange, HHS shall step in and establish such exchange itself, the President says this means Federal exchanges are State exchanges. Right is left and up is down.

But let's return to the real provision in dispute in King, the one that defines eligibility for subsidies. This provision says, again, that an individual is eligible for each month that she is covered by a plan that she "enrolled in through an Exchange established by the State." An exchange established by the Federal Government is by definition not an exchange established by the State, regardless of whether the Federal exchange is a backstop or not.

It gets even worse for the President because the provision additionally specifies that the State exchange must have been established "under section 1311 of the [statute]." That section sets forth the requirements for creating State-run exchanges. Nowhere does it mention Federal exchanges. Rather, the conditions for creation of Federal exchanges appear in a different section—section 1321. Under no plausible reading of the text does a State exchange established under section 1311 mean a Federal exchange established under section 1321.

Advocates of the President's position would have us believe that statutes are infinitely malleable—up can mean down, right can mean left, established by a State can mean not established by a State. What matters to them is advancing some vague notion of statutory purpose that coheres with the President's leftwing agenda, regardless of what the statute actually says.

Those of us on the other side, however, insist that text matters, words matter. What the statute says is what

matters, because at the end of the day the words in our statutes and in our Constitution are what bind our leaders and what prevent them from doing whatever they want.

The administration's actions in King have undermined the rule of law and contravened important constitutional checks on the President's authority. As has increasingly become the case under President Obama, it is now up to the Supreme Court to rein in the President's overreach and to reaffirm the fundamental obligation of all government officials to follow the law. I surely hope the Court will do so.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to address today's vote to override President Obama's veto of the bipartisan Hoeven-Manchin bill to authorize the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Our economy and North America's energy security would greatly benefit from building this pipeline. It would increase our GDP by approximately \$3.4 billion annually. The State Department, which has provided clear-headed analysis of the benefits of this project, has found that Keystone would support roughly 42,000 jobs during the construction phase alone. It would provide refineries with up to 830,000 barrels a day of North American oil.

Moreover, the Keystone XL Pipeline would be an environmentally sound way to transport this oil. The State Department's extensive environmental impact statement concluded that building the pipeline would actually be better for the environment than not building it.

We have to be clear here. This oil is going to go to market no matter what. Building Keystone would take oil off the tracks and off the roads, transporting it in a way that is safer, more efficient, more environmentally sound, and better for creating good-paying American jobs.

In his veto message, President Obama suggested that an issue such as this is somehow too important to be left to the legislative process and that we should trust in the integrity of the regulatory process.

This is exactly the sort of debate we should be having in the Senate. This is the body that is supposed to debate the important issues of the day. When a project as important as this is stalled without meaningful justification for so long, our involvement is even more important.

In our consideration of this bill, we legislated according to the best traditions of this body, including robust debate, an open amendment process, and regular order. After years of mismanagement, our consideration of this bill showed how the Senate is back at work on behalf of the American people under our new leadership.

While I certainly hope we will find another means of approving the Keystone XL Pipeline, I am naturally dis-

appointed that we came just a few votes short of overriding the President's veto and enacting this bill into law. Furthermore, I can certainly understand why many Americans will view this occasion as yet another example of how Washington is broken.

In many respects, I share this same frustration. Nevertheless, we cannot allow ourselves to slouch toward pessimism and disillusionment about every institution. Indeed, I think my fellow colleagues on both sides of the aisle merit praise for their responsible handling of this bill. Instead, we should shine a light on where exactly the problem is and offer real solutions to make Washington work on behalf of the American people.

At the end of the day, the Keystone XL Pipeline and so many other bureaucratic failures just demonstrate that our regulatory bureaucracy is broken. After all, this project is now in its sixth year of limbo, waiting for a single permit to be issued. This debate has gone on longer than an entire term of a U.S. Senator.

It should not take years and years of navigating the Federal bureaucracy only to have the government decide not to make a decision. This new Congress is focused on helping to create jobs and getting our economy back on the right track, which is why regulatory reform must be a key part of our agenda over the next 2 years. We must strive not only to approve this particularly important project but also to prevent similar abuses from occurring in the future.

Perhaps the two most troublesome features of the modern administrative state are, first, the size of the regulatory burden on the economy and, second, the lack of accountability in the regulatory bureaucracy. Both problems have been illustrated by the Keystone XL project, but they manifest themselves across the board throughout the regulatory process.

The growing Federal regulatory burden has been a concern for decades, but the problem is now worse than ever. Both the number of regulations and their combined cost have exploded in recent years. The American people are now bound by more than 1 million individual restrictions in the Federal Register, with a total cost of around \$1.86 trillion each year. To put that in perspective, that is about 11 percent of our total GDP, it amounts to about \$15,000 per household, and it totals over \$300 billion more than annual individual and corporate taxes combined. In short, our regulatory burden is enormous.

Even as we resist President Obama's mad dash to add new rules, our Nation simply cannot afford to ignore the crushing burden of existing regulations. They weigh down our efforts to boost economic growth and make it impossible to get our country back on track.

Every President, from Jimmy Carter to Barack Obama, has embraced the

notion that outdated, unsuccessful or otherwise ineffective regulations should be repealed. Nevertheless, the cumulative regulatory burden continues to expand year after year.

To address this growing problem, I will be partnering with Congressman JASON SMITH to sponsor the Senate version of the SCRUB Act—Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome. This legislation creates a bipartisan commission to examine the entire administrative corpus in search of regulations that are obsolete, outdated, ineffective, overlapping, duplicative or unjustified. Its goal is to achieve a 15-percent cost reduction in our Nation's total regulatory burden. The Commission can recommend either immediate repeal or incremental reform through a flexible procedure that puts the agencies and stakeholders in the driver's seat.

The SCRUB Act transforms a long-standing bipartisan commitment to retrospective regulatory review from mere rhetoric into meaningful reality. It would result in lower prices, higher wages, and more job opportunities for hard-working Americans. All the while, such commonsense regulatory review poses no risk to our health, our safety or our environment. It is the kind of legislation that can earn support from both sides of the aisle and for which there is a realistic path to having it enacted into law.

A second critical flaw in the current administrative state is a fundamental lack of accountability in how the Federal Government makes and enforces regulations. Far too often the agencies and interest groups manipulate the rules and stack the decks against innovators, entrepreneurs, and ordinary citizens.

Thankfully, there are a number of potential avenues for meaningful reform, but the one area that has thus far escaped much legislative attention is the role the Federal judiciary plays in the regulatory process. Given the broad authorities Congress has ceded to administrative agencies, the courts often stand as the only truth independent check on increasingly out-of-control regulators. But recent abuses by the political branches have created serious challenges for effective and appropriate judicial review on the regulatory process.

By writing vague laws, Congress has created extraordinary flexible grants of authority that are both unwise and constitutionally troublesome. Judicial deference to agency interpretations of the law has magnified this power to an extreme degree. Although originally intended as a means of curtailing judicial activism, Chevron deference and its associated doctrines have resulted in a gross misallocation of lawmaking authority. Such doctrines have consigned courts to be rubberstamps, rather than effective checks on administrative overreach.

The threat of toothless judicial oversight of increasingly problematic regu-

latory action was only heightened when President Obama and his allies packed the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals with compliant judges even less inclined to engage in meaningful administrative review, and Congress's creation of broadly available private rights of action to challenge administrative decisions and regulatory activities has opened another avenue for abuse of the courts.

While these provisions provide important opportunities for regulated parties to defend their liberties, too often they have allowed groups with no concrete stake in the process to use the courts as a means to drive their own ideological agendas.

Worse yet, inconsistent efforts by the judiciary to define the constitutional limits on standing have inadvertently created a perverse environment where businesses with real skin in the game are often shut out of court, while special interest groups with no meaningful injury in fact are allowed to litigate.

Restoring the constitutionally proper judicial role is vital to returning accountability to the regulatory process. In reviewing agency actions, courts should hear only real cases and controversies, where litigants have concrete interests at stake. But when they do, they should state firmly what the law is and not simply ratify what the regulatory agencies argue that the law should be.

Legislation to ensure meaningful reform on each front and thereby bringing the administrative state more in line with the Constitution will be one of my top priorities in this Congress.

It is disappointing that we could not override the President's veto of this important legislation. The failure to authorize Keystone demonstrates how broken our regulatory process is. I hope we can use this occasion of bipartisan consensus to move forward in ways that can fix our out-of-control bureaucracy and get Washington back to work for the American people.

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 660 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ARCTIC

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is quiet around here today, this afternoon. We have been notified that we are not going to be having any further votes this week because Washington, DC, is anticipating a winter storm. It is March 4. I think most people here in Washington had hoped that winter had already come and gone, but that is not the case.

In my home State of Alaska, this is the time of year that we welcome winter. We embrace winter. In fact, I am going to be going up to the State this Friday to attend the kickoff of our biggest sporting event, which is the Iditarod sled dog race, 1,100 miles, where about 70 teams of dogs and intrepid mushers make the trek typically between the Anchorage area and 1,100 miles up to Nome.

This winter has been a little bit different. It is warmer back home than most of us Alaskans would like, and we have actually had to reroute the Iditarod for the second time in the race's history. It is going to be starting out of my hometown in Fairbanks, and rerouting the race so that it is still a thousand-mile race. But it does speak to the fact that we are seeing some changes up there, at least for this winter, in terms of our temperatures and our climate.

We have a lot of folks around here anticipating what we are going to see tomorrow who are wondering what is going on with climate? What are we seeing? Is this temporary in nature, or are we going to start seeing more arctic conditions here on the eastern seaboard?

I want to talk about the Arctic today. I want to talk about the value of an amazing part of the globe and the opportunities we have in the Arctic, the opportunities we have as an Arctic nation.

We have a map here. This is the bathymetric chart of the Arctic Ocean. It is a view that perhaps most Americans are not intimately familiar with. You look at it and say, where on planet Earth is this?

To locate everybody a little bit, here you have Russia, Greenland, Canada over here, and the United States. This is the State of Alaska with all of the interior arctic areas there, but an amazing mass located at the top of the globe, an area where, quite honestly, most Americans put it out of sight, out of mind. The only time they really think about the Arctic is when there are temperatures that make it feel like the Arctic.

There are probably going to be a lot of folks here in Washington, DC, tomorrow who are thinking, yes, maybe we do live in an Arctic nation because I am feeling it here. It doesn't make any difference whether we have a storm coming at us or whether it is the

heat of the summer in Washington, DC, or the fall in New England, or the warm winter temperatures in a place such as Arizona. Wherever you reside in this country, you are part of an Arctic nation. I am willing to bet that when the Presiding Officer was elected to represent the State of Colorado, he didn't think at that time that he was also elected to be a Senator for the Arctic. But, in fact, he is because we are an arctic nation. In Colorado—I suppose the Presiding Officer is probably thinking, tell me why the Arctic is relevant to Colorado, other than the fact that we also share some good winters and have an appreciation for the snow and colder climates. But in the State of Colorado, 30 percent—30.5 percent of the total exports that go out of Colorado are exported to arctic nations.

Now think about that. Thirty percent of what goes out of Colorado is exported to an Arctic nation, one of the eight Arctic nations—Canada, Finland, Greenland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden. These are your trading partners.

Our colleague from Wyoming was just on the floor. Let's see what Wyoming exports. They are about in the same category as Colorado, about 28.3 percent of the total exports from Wyoming are exported to the Arctic nations. When we think about the dollars that are coming to Colorado or Wyoming or Maryland as a result of exports from your States, it causes us to maybe perhaps look at the Arctic a little bit differently.

We have an opportunity to build upon a dynamic relationship, an evolving part of the globe, as we prepare as a nation to assume the chair of the Arctic Council. This event will take place on April 25, just a couple of months from now. But the Arctic Council is the intergovernmental forum for the eight nations that have territory inside the Arctic Circle. Again, this is pretty much this map here: Canada, Russia, Denmark through Greenland, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, and then, of course, by virtue of the State of Alaska, the United States.

The Arctic Council also includes six nonvoting permanent participant groups that represent the indigenous people of the Arctic. There are also 32 observer entities. The interesting thing with these observer participants, 12 of the 32 are non-Arctic nations, so areas that are not countries that we would think of that would have a keen interest in what is going on with Arctic policy. This is France, Germany, the United Kingdom, China, Japan.

What is really impressive to me is that we are seeing the growth in the number of non-Arctic nations that are seeking observer status. Back in the 2013 Arctic Council ministerial meeting we had in Sweden, six nations were admitted as observers. Many others have indicated their interest as well.

It is also interesting to note that with the admission of China, all five

permanent members of the United Nations Security Council are now members or observers of the Arctic Council. Also represented are 8 of the world's 10 largest economies based on GDP, which is an indicator of the level of importance the world ascribes to the Arctic.

What has happened with the Arctic is, again, a keen interest from all over the globe in what is happening. Why is that? What is going on that is capturing the interests, the imagination, the opportunity for nations all over the globe? So much of it is because this area, an area that for most has always been locked up in a world of ice and permanently frozen in time. So to even imagine the possibilities of what could unfold in the Arctic was so foreign that only the most adventurous of the explorers ever pushed out.

It is changing up North, whether it is the northern sea route coming across on the Russian side, whether it is the Northwest Passage, whether it is nations that are looking to explore for resources, whether it is those involved in maritime traffic and engaging in a level of commerce that are looking for that shorter route that will cut days, weeks, off of a journey and, therefore, costs off of the expense of shipping. Whether it is the tourists—cruise ships are coming across the top. Up in Point Barrow, right up here at the top of the world, you have cruise ships that are moving through those waters—the ultimate ecotourists and those who are seeking something different.

The Arctic is notable within the international community from an economic perspective. As its shipping lanes open up, we have additional areas that become accessible for resource development. Again, the rise of tourism is an example of the increased accessibility of the Arctic.

It is also notable from a political perspective as the region that is not bogged down by the inertia of longstanding disputes. Think about so many parts of the world where there have been decades, if not centuries of conflict. This is a part of the world that does not have that overlay, if you will. It does not have the entrenched views that make international cooperation in other areas difficult.

Instead, it is an area that seeks to promote collaboration and remain a zone of peace. Think about the conversations I am able to have with Secretary Kerry, as I did just a few weeks back, talking about the Arctic and being able to speak to the Secretary of State about how we can work more collaboratively, how we can keep an area as a zone of peace as he deals with hot spots all over the globe—to know that there is a cool place, not only from a physical perspective but perhaps from an emotional and a political perspective, where perhaps we can be working together to advance goals and initiatives rather than constantly being at issue with one another.

It also is a region that is writing its history as we speak. This has been

around for a long time. But what is happening at the top of the globe is like a clean sheet. It is an opportunity for us to write history. It is even more important for the United States to take a lead in guiding international policy decisions within this area. This is why I am calling on colleagues in the Senate to join me, to step up, to help us not only to build out policy initiatives but really to take that leadership role, as we should be doing as an Arctic nation.

So I have joined together with the Senator from Maine, Mr. KING, to form a new caucus. I know we have plenty of caucuses around here, but I am asking colleagues to consider joining this caucus, the Senate Arctic Caucus. This caucus has a mission to convene conversations among Members on issues relating to defense, science, energy, environment, commerce, trade, maritime affairs, the well-being of the indigenous peoples of the Arctic, to raise awareness about the importance of the Arctic, and to advance a coordinated effort toward investment in infrastructure that will benefit all Americans, including those who live in the Arctic.

I should let colleagues know that when I am offering this opportunity to join a caucus, it is not just to say that I am paying attention to Arctic issues in name only. We really want to try to educate because, again, I think the awareness of what is happening in the Arctic has captivated the imagination and the attention of people around the world, of nations around the world. It should captivate the imagination and the attention of every Member in this body. So each Member will be receiving an invitation to join this caucus, along with a breakdown of each State's exports to the Arctic region, to help demonstrate why the Arctic matters to all 50 of the States.

So as I have outlined to the Presiding Officer, about the benefits that Colorado receives and the benefits that Wyoming receives, all Members will be getting similar figures. It was 10 years ago when I started an Arctic awareness campaign. That was a long time ago. It was an effort to get folks—not only within the legislative body but within the administration—to pay attention to what was going on within the region.

It started out pretty simply. I can remember that I was on the Foreign Relations Committee, and we had the nomination hearing for Condoleezza Rice to be Secretary of State. I asked her a question: So what are we doing in the Arctic to ensure that the Arctic remains a zone of peace? Or I asked something to that effect.

I think I caught her flatfooted. The next time I saw her before the Foreign Relations Committee, she was up to speed and engaged. But I can state with some certainty here that in 2005 the State Department was just not prepared to have a discussion on these issues.

Now, I am not going to claim full credit here. But move forward a little

bit with the clock. It was good to see the movement within the administration. When Hillary Clinton was Secretary of State, she was the first Secretary of State to participate in an Arctic Council ministerial meeting. I think that was probably prompted by some visits she had made to view the Arctic, including the U.S. Arctic in Barrow, when she was a Member of this body. But as Secretary of State she traveled to Nuuk, Greenland in 2011. I accompanied her. Then in 2013 Secretary Kerry went to the ministerial meeting in Kiruna, Sweden. In 2015 Secretary Kerry will again participate in this year's meeting in Canada, where the Arctic Council chairmanship will be handed over to the United States.

I started off my comments by talking about what is going on with the weather and people feeling like we are under an Arctic siege here right now in Washington. But I think it is safe to say that Arctic awareness is at an alltime high. But unfortunately, the investment has not matched the interest. One barometer of your interest when you are talking about the Arctic is: How do you move in the Arctic if there is ice up there? You have to be able to plow through some ice. This is where an icebreaker comes into play.

But icebreakers are expensive. The Coast Guard estimates that it is going to be about \$1 billion. It takes about 10 years to build. If I were to ask anybody in this body how many icebreakers the United States has, I think you would say: Well, of course we have an icebreaker up there.

We have one medium-strength icebreaker, the Healy, which does a good job for us. But our only Polar Class vessel, the Polar Star is on assignment to Antarctica for the next 5 years. We will not see her in the Arctic for 5 full years. The life expectancy, the useful life of the Polar Star is only 6 to 8 years. It takes 10 years to build a new one.

We are sitting here as a nation woefully behind when it comes to Arctic infrastructure, if you define it by icebreaking capacity. Russia is cleaning our clock in terms of the number of icebreakers they have. They have 27. Our own Coast Guard's High Latitude Study says it is going to require six major icebreakers—three heavy and three medium-sized icebreakers—to fulfill its statutory requirements.

Even China has one icebreaker. They are building six more. India—do you think of India as an Arctic Nation? They are considering building an icebreaker. Why? Because they see the Arctic opportunity. They want to be part of an area on the globe that is piquing their interest for a host of different reasons.

So as others in the Arctic region, whether it is Russia or whether it is Canada, as they continue some pretty aggressive national plans, combined with state investment to develop their Arctic resources and advance commerce in the north, the United States

needs to be a participant. But we need to be more than a participant. We need to be a leader. We lead everywhere else. We led to the moon. We know more about the mapping of Mars than we know about mapping in the Arctic.

We need to step it up. It is exciting to think that we can step it up. I am hoping that we will be able to focus our attention on these issues. It is not just the resources and infrastructure that will make the Arctic a national priority. It is not just preparing for a 2-year chairmanship. It is about what the vision is—the long-term vision for the United States' role in an emerging part of the globe. It is as dynamic as anyplace out there.

But we have to be ready. We lack certain basic infrastructure needs. I mentioned the need for an icebreaker. I am going to be introducing legislation, hopefully very soon, to develop a solid foundation and put some building blocks in place for that investment, including a focus on obtaining more accurate data for charting the Arctic. We simply are so far behind in our hydrographic charting. We need to do better with our ice forecasting, with our weather observation stations, with our weather buoys, with our monitoring out in our oceans, with just having a level of communications and understanding of what we have. So, as we look to the area, we have at least to be able to assess the accuracy of Arctic weather and water forecasting. We have to be able to understand whether we have gaps in Arctic weather and sea-ice observing networks and the status of our sea-ice analysis and forecasting services.

So we are going to be having a hearing tomorrow in the energy committee. We may be the only committee that is open for business. We may be the only Senators that are here in the building. But we are going to be having the first-ever hearing on the Arctic. I think it is fair to say that it is not only the first hearing in the energy committee but the first-ever hearing on the Arctic as a whole, instead of just bits and pieces of it.

So I am encouraging all of my colleagues who may be locked out because they could not jump on a flight quickly enough or they could not get on the road soon enough. But we will be having, I think, a very informative hearing tomorrow in the energy committee to focus on what, again, I am calling Arctic opportunities. I do not know if the timing of the hearing was just prescient on my part and that we knew that this was going to happen. If so, I should also do part-time work as a weather forecaster. But I do think it is certainly timely. In fact, it is long past time that we focus again on an area that hosts amazing promise and opportunity for leadership as a nation. I would encourage all of my colleagues to join us in this new Senate Arctic Caucus. Embrace your inner Arctic self. It really is a good place to be.

With that, I see that my colleague from Wyoming is here. He has been

very patient. As I mentioned to the Senator from Colorado, our Presiding Officer right now, Colorado enjoys good benefits from the State of Alaska. For the fine folks in Wyoming, 28 percent of their total exports from the State of Wyoming do go to Arctic nations. So there is a connection. I look forward to working with both of my colleagues as members of the energy committee on these issues of great importance to our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, first, let me congratulate our colleague from Alaska, who is the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. That committee is in capable hands under her direction, whether the Arctic—all energy. She is committed to affordable energy, available energy, reliable energy, secure energy, and American energy.

So we are in good stead with the new chairman who has taken over in January. As members of that committee, it is a great opportunity for us to work with her for affordable energy for all in America. We have opportunities for exports, and it is good to see her continued leadership on this and other topics.

I appreciate her hard work.

KING V. BURWELL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, earlier today the United States Supreme Court heard arguments in an important case, a consequential case. It is called *King v. Burwell*. This case was brought on behalf of millions of Americans who have been harmed by the President's unlawful expansion of his unworkable and unaffordable health care law.

Sometime before the end of June, the Court will decide if the law passed by Congress means what it says or if it means what the President wishes it said.

It looks at one very specific and very important part of the President's health care law. The law says that Washington could help subsidize the premiums of people buying health insurance coverage through exchanges established by the States. President Obama decided that wasn't enough. He wanted to use taxpayer dollars on behalf of people buying insurance in the Federal exchange as well. That is it. That is the legal question.

The law, written by Democrats in Congress—written behind closed doors—only authorized subsidies for one group, but the President paid them out for another group. The case is not about the Constitution, it is about the rule of law.

I was at the Court this morning listening to the arguments, and I expect that the Justices will strike down the way the President expanded the law.

Time after time this administration has claimed power it did not have and taken actions it cannot defend. The

way the administration expanded the health care law is one of the most blatant of these power grabs, because when Democrats passed the law, they got exactly what they wanted. They rejected Republican idea after Republican idea that could have made this law better. They forced it through Congress with absolutely no Republican support.

It still wasn't good enough for the Obama administration, so it expanded the law some more. ObamaCare is a minefield, and the administration refused to give people the information they need to help them navigate it.

The Obama administration knew this court case was coming well before the enrollment period to buy insurance for this year even started. So did the American President tell the American people these subsidies might not be legal? Did he warn people? What did the President actually say? Did he warn anyone signing up in the exchanges that they might not be seeing the real price of any insurance they picked? No, the President refused to do so.

He knew he might lose the case. He knew it. He knew the risk he was making people take, but the President didn't say a word—people who were just trying to make the best choices for their families. The White House did not tell people the truth about their options.

Several Republican Senators wrote to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of the Treasury asking them to warn people. We said people need this information. There are thousands of dollars at stake for families, and the Obama administration should at least tell them what might happen.

The Secretary has refused to level with the American people.

Just the other day, the Secretary of Health and Human Services admitted she had no plan B. Her letter is clear and it is consequential. She admits that if the Supreme Court rules against the Obama administration, the President does not have the authority—does not have the authority—to use administrative actions to undo the Supreme Court decision. The administration purposefully waited to admit that until after the open enrollment period ended. It didn't want to take the chance that warning people might hurt its enrollment numbers.

Today at the Supreme Court, several Justices were skeptical of the administration's legal defense. I expect the Supreme Court to say the President must enforce the law Congress has passed, rather than the law the President wishes Congress had passed. If it does, it will help rein in this out-of-control White House. It will tell the Obama administration it must obey the law and that the President cannot keep making up the rules as he goes along.

The health care law is clear. The President was wrong to expand his health insurance exchanges beyond

what the law allowed. The President was wrong to use the IRS to make up rules and penalties. The Obama administration was irresponsible for not warning people.

Republicans will have a plan to protect the people harmed by the President's action and to create a path away from ObamaCare. First, our plan will help the millions of people who have been hurt by the White House's decision to illegally implement its health care law. It would be unfair for families to lose their coverage in the middle of the year just because they believed the false promises made by Barack Obama. So Republicans will help Americans keep their coverage for a transitional period.

Second, it will give States the freedom and flexibility to create better, more competitive health insurance markets, offering more options and different choices at home where people live, not decisions made in Washington.

We want to allow States to come up with health care systems that work for them, not the bureaucrats in the Nation's Capital. We would give every State the ability to create a better market, better opportunities suited to the needs of that State's citizens. It is time for President Obama to stop putting people through all of the pain this law has created.

The President's health care law continues to be unpopular, unworkable, and unaffordable. He needs to finally negotiate with Republicans to give people the reform they wanted all along, which is what people asked for—the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am pleased to follow my distinguished colleague and friend from the State of Wyoming, and I rise to talk about exactly the same issue and to differ with him, respectfully, that the current law is unworkable, unpopular, and unaffordable. In fact, history demonstrates that it is certainly working.

In the State of Connecticut we know well that it is working as it was intended because we have a State-run exchange, and we have cut the number of uninsured by one-half, while improving health care quality, lowering Medicaid spending, and making remarkable achievements across a whole range of metrics. That same story is true of our Nation as a whole, whether there are State-run exchanges or Federal supervised exchanges.

Today's point, whether it is in the Supreme Court or here, should be extraordinarily encouraging about the Congress's approval of the Affordable Care Act and the fact that it is working across the country. It is succeeding in delivering exactly what was intended, what the Congress promised, what its advocates saw, access for all Americans to affordable health insurance.

The ACA is working today to protect Americans from abuses, and I saw them literally day in and day out as attorney general: people who lost health insurance when they got sick, people who were denied coverage because of a pre-existing condition, people who were charged more because of their gender, people who were denied the basic care they needed and deserved for themselves, their children, and their families, giving them access not only to health care but also to work and to family stability.

I saw every day as attorney general how imperiled and critical health care is in this country and how much we need to do more and do better in this area.

The uninsured rate in this country is the lowest it has been in 7 years, and we have lowered it a remarkable 25 percent in just 1 year. Eight million people have gained health insurance through the exchanges who didn't have it before, and I know that States with federally run exchanges have made improvements, just as Connecticut has done, which is fully in accordance with the absolutely crystal-clear intent of this Congress and this law to provide affordable health insurance for all Americans, regardless of where they live, what State, what ZIP Code, whatever their occupation and background.

Let's be clear. As with any big law there are kinks that need to be ironed out, there are glitches that need to be resolved, but the Affordable Care Act is working now and working better every month, every year.

The legal issue before the Court has been debated today in depth, and I believe with the great persuasiveness—similar to the Presiding Officer, I had the honor to serve as a law clerk to the Supreme Court and watch many arguments. To say that today is historic I think is true, but in my view almost every argument before the Supreme Court is historic in its consequences—some more than others, but every one is consequential because cases don't reach the U.S. Supreme Court unless they are difficult and consequential, and issues of statutory interpretation that are said to be simple often are more complicated than they may seem.

But I know, without a doubt, having read this statute, that the text and structure of the Affordable Care Act clearly demonstrate—in fact, they unmistakably demand—that Federal tax credits be available to every eligible taxpayer in every State in this country.

I have done arguments in the U.S. Supreme Court, and I had the honor to be attorney general of the State of Connecticut as well as a U.S. attorney.

Having looked at this statute as a whole, having read the words that need to be interpreted by the Supreme Court, I have reached this conclusion: Contrary to the argument of partisan opponents, both the act itself and the plainly overwhelming evidence from its consideration and passage demonstrate its nationwide scope.

I wasn't here at the time it was passed, but from the legislative history and, most important, from the structure and language of the act itself, there seems to be irrefutably and incontrovertibly an understanding that tax credits would be available regardless of which governmental agency set up an exchange. The act simply would not have worked any other way and courts have an obligation to read statutes in a way that makes the most sense in terms of the overriding intent and purpose of the Congress.

The financial support simply, for universal coverage, would not be there without this interpretation, a common-sense interpretation that makes sense of congressional intent, purpose, and the law as a whole.

The law has given so many families across the country access to care for the first time. There has been an effort to repeal this act legislatively. There has been an effort to overturn it in the courts. Both have failed because it is working and because it is constitutional.

A ruling for the plaintiffs in this case that is now before the Court would not only be contrary to law, it would be catastrophic to millions of families who owe their health insurance to the structure the ACA has established. It would be, in fact, a human tragedy as well as a legal travesty.

There is simply no alternative that has been offered by opponents to this law. It is difficult therefore to see how this misguided lawsuit is anything other than one more cynical attempt to repeal or overturn this law—or torpedo it by any means necessary, regardless of the collateral damage to millions of innocent people who would suffer loss of health care insurance and health care. And the tragedy would be not only for them but for our entire Nation because the cost would ripple throughout our society—the cost in lost work; the cost in families suffering from the consequences of bankruptcy, which is caused most frequently by health care-related financial issues; the cost in the ability of our workforce to function at the height of efficiency that we all need; and the cost ultimately in diseases that have to be treated and ailments that have to be addressed and preventable health care consequences for our children. Prevention is one of the most cost-effective goals of the Affordable Care Act.

So I will work with my colleagues to support this act and to determine what other efforts can make progress toward the ultimate goal that we all should share—an America that is free from disease or injury that will bankrupt our families, an America that is healthier and better able to afford health care, and quality and timely health treatment.

The lack of standing on the part of these plaintiffs seems clear, but putting aside all of the technical issues and the legal debate, the Affordable Care Act has allowed America to make

huge, exciting strides in the direction of better health care. So we should be proud of the act passed by this body. Even many of us perhaps who were not here at the time can look forward to how much further we can go, and America has that fundamental obligation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am back now for the 91st consecutive week the Senate has been in session to urge my colleagues to wake up and pay attention to the threat of climate change. I am delighted and proud to be joined today by my colleague and friend Senator BALDWIN from Wisconsin to consider the effects of carbon pollution in her State.

According to scientists at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, weather stations around the State show that average temperatures in Wisconsin increased by about 1.1 degrees Fahrenheit between 1950 and 2006. During the same period Wisconsin got wetter. Annual average precipitation increased by almost 3 inches. These changes are likely to continue and intensify as carbon pollution continues to pile up in the atmosphere. Researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison estimate that by midcentury the State could warm by 4 to 9 degrees Fahrenheit. By the end of the century the climate in Wisconsin may look more like that of present-day Missouri or Oklahoma, raising the possibility of a dramatic shift in the Wisconsin economy and way of life.

This winter has been pretty cold in the Eastern United States and in Wisconsin. So was last year. Cold arctic air dipping down over North America drops the mercury. As we continue into a time of what has been called global weirding, scientists say that climate change may make these cold blasts more common as it alters patterns in the atmosphere. In a nutshell, on top of the long-term warming trend lies weather disorder. But the long-term warming trend is apparent. New research from UW-Madison's Professor Jonathan Martin shows that last year the so-called cold pool of frigid air that accumulates in the Northern Hemisphere each winter was the smallest since records began in the winter of 1948 to 1949. This year it is on track to be even smaller.

Sadly, some of our colleagues just can't face up to the role that human activity—such as our carbon pollution from burning fossil fuel—plays in the

changes we are seeing around us. One colleague—indeed, the senior Senator from Wisconsin—is among this group. In January he voted against amendments to the Keystone XL bill stating that climate change is real and that humans contribute to it. Well, in 2013 the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel—his State's largest paper—noted that this type of denial was at odds with both Wisconsin opinion and Wisconsin scientific evidence. The senior Senator from Wisconsin, wrote the paper's editorial board, "is just flat-out wrong." The paper went on to say, "We elect politicians to make tough decisions and find solutions, not to shut their eyes and cover their ears, as Johnson repeatedly has done on this issue." The article continued: "[S]tubbornly denying the facts on climate change may be akin to denying the facts on evolution or whether the Earth is flat."

Professor John Kutzbach of the University of Wisconsin—an elected member of the National Academy of Sciences—was among a group of climate scientists who in 2011 wrote to us in Congress imploring us to take action on climate change. Here is what the letter said:

Congress needs to understand that scientists have concluded, based on a systematic review of all of the evidence, that climate change caused by human activities raises serious risks to our national and economic security and our health both here and around the world. It is time for Congress to move on to the policy debate.

Well, I welcome that debate. Indeed, the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Senator MURKOWSKI, recently said on the floor of the Senate that she hopes we can "get beyond the discussion as to whether or not climate change is real and talk about . . . what do we do." So where is that debate? Where are the other Republicans? Let's finally talk about the cost of action and the cost of inaction.

The Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts was formed in 2007 by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and the University of Wisconsin Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies. The scientists and public officials in this program are doing important work to help the State of Wisconsin understand and prepare for climate change. They are studying how it will affect wildlife, water resources, public health, and important Wisconsin industries such as forestry, agriculture, and shipping and tourism on the Great Lakes.

Climate change threatens iconic aspects of the Wisconsin environment and economy. The Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts Agriculture Working Group reports that higher summer temperatures and increasing drought will create significant stress on livestock, even touching—dare I say it—Wisconsin's famed cheese industry. Victor Cabrera, an assistant professor in the University of Wisconsin-Madison Dairy Science Department—they have one—says heat stress

interferes with fertility and milk production. Dairy cows could give as much as 10 percent less milk. The U.S. Department of Agriculture predicts that by 2030 climate change will cost the U.S. dairy sector between \$79 and \$199 million a year in lost production. When opponents say reducing carbon pollution will cost too much, they conveniently leave out the cost of doing nothing, such as these costs.

Well, the dairy State is not waiting for Congress to take action. The University of Wisconsin is leading a USDA-funded effort to identify dairy practices that minimize the emission of greenhouse gases and make dairies more resilient to the effects of a changing climate. Some Wisconsin dairy farmers are burning excess methane in enormous manure digesters—that is a frightening concept—to generate their own renewable electricity.

Wisconsin sportsmen know that Wisconsin has more than 10,000 miles of trout streams—some of the best trout fishing in the country. Cold-water fish, such as the brook trout, are there, but they are highly sensitive to temperature increases in streams. Under the worst cases analyzed by the researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, “brook trout are projected to be completely lost from Wisconsin’s streams.” Even the best-case scenarios see losses of as much as 44 percent of the brookies’ current range by midcentury. Other cold-water species, such as the brown trout, are not much better off.

Trout Unlimited—sportsmen and conservationists working to protect trout streams in the Driftless Area in southwest Wisconsin and parts of Minnesota, Illinois, and Iowa—did a 2009 study showing fishing in the Driftless Area adds over \$1 billion per year to the surrounding economies.

We have heard of loggers having trouble getting to the timber because the ground is thawed and too soggy to hold up logging equipment. For Wisconsin’s loggers, the hard, frozen winter ground is what lets them move logging equipment. According to a study out of the University of Wisconsin, that period of frozen ground has decreased by 2 to 3 weeks since 1948, shortening the working window for loggers before their gear bogs down.

And then there is the badger. The Upper Midwest and Great Lakes Landscape Conservation Cooperative even lists the great Wisconsin badger as one of the species at risk from regional climate change.

Senator BALDWIN knows that, done right, action on climate change saves Americans money, spurs American innovation, and creates new American industry and jobs. Focus on Energy, Wisconsin’s statewide energy efficiency program, has been helping Wisconsin families and businesses save money and reduce energy use since 2001. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission expects this program to inject over \$900

million into the State’s economy, and net over 6,000 new Wisconsin jobs over the next decade.

I am very grateful to my friend Senator BALDWIN for her strong leadership on behalf of the people of Wisconsin to stave off the worst effects of climate change in her home State.

I yield to her now.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his commitment to addressing the threats that climate change poses globally, to our country, and to our States. I thank him for highlighting some of those threats to my home State of Wisconsin.

Let there be no doubt that global climate change is real. It is a fact. The question is not whether it is happening, but rather how we are going to address it. Are we going to do all we can to leave the next generation a safer and healthier world?

As my friend from Rhode Island just noted, climate change will be costly to our economy and to our very way of life, and the longer we wait to act, the more costly these impacts will be.

Throughout our history, the State of Wisconsin has been a proud home to environmental leaders who have worked to pass on a stronger environment to future generations—Aldo Leopold, John Muir, and Senator Gaylord Nelson, founder of Earth Day and the namesake for the Nelson Institute at the University of Wisconsin, which my colleague from Rhode Island just mentioned in his remarks. As a representative of our great State, it is one of my top priorities to follow in this legacy and to preserve our natural resources and quality of life for future generations.

It is not hard to see why Wisconsinites have always deeply valued environmental protection. Looking out at the crystal clear waters of Lake Superior from its south shore, or standing atop Rib Mountain gazing at the forests and farmlands of central Wisconsin, to casting your fishing rod in the world-class trout streams of the Driftless region in southwestern Wisconsin, there is no question that we are blessed by the natural beauty of our State.

But even now, the impact of climate change can be seen on each of these landscapes and in the economies they support. We see it in our agriculture—growing seasons are shifting, and extreme weather harms our crops, and we have increasing concerns about drought and our groundwater.

In fact, NASA recently warned that within a few decades—within our lifetimes—the United States may enter a megadrought that could last 30 years.

In my home State, the resulting decreased soil moisture will put additional stress on farmers, on private wells, and on municipal drinking water systems. These prolonged droughts, combined with increased intensity of storm events and changing temperature patterns, will force farmers to make changes to how and what they

grow. This is extremely troubling, as agriculture is an \$88 billion industry in my home State of Wisconsin.

We also see the negative effects of climate change on our Great Lakes. In Lake Michigan, for example, lake levels are largely driven by precipitation. Changes in precipitation patterns due to climate change may cause more dramatic fluctuations or prolonged changes in lake levels.

In addition, data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shows that summertime surface water temperatures have increased 8 degrees Fahrenheit since 1980. Warmer surface water temperatures disrupt the food chain, which threatens our fish population. As these adverse effects are expected to worsen in the coming decades, they will inevitably lead to more wildlife disease, and warmer waters that will drive out native fish.

Changing water levels also create new challenges for property owners and communities along the Great Lakes. Infrastructure may need to be redesigned, insurance demands may change, and new health risks may emerge or be exacerbated as additional stress is imposed on our sewer systems. Each of these will hurt our local economies.

Tourism is also a major part of Wisconsin’s economy, and the Northwoods is a favorite destination to fish, camp, hunt, and snowmobile. But projections show that by midcentury, the climate of areas such as Bayfield and Vilas County in the Northwoods will be more similar to what we have known in the southeastern part of the State of Wisconsin in counties such as Waukesha County.

Meanwhile, Waukesha County’s climate could be more similar to what we used to expect hundreds of miles south in the neighboring State of Illinois. The impacts on tourism, recreation, and the landscapes we hold near and dear may be dramatic, and the threats may be daunting. But we cannot continue to let the challenges overwhelm us and cause inaction on our part.

Wisconsin’s State motto is “Forward.” The people of Wisconsin have never been afraid of the challenges we face or what the future holds. We have a strong progressive tradition of confronting our challenges and working together to shape our future for the next generation.

In fact, analysis by the World Resources Institute in 2013 found that Wisconsin is well positioned to meet national goals for carbon pollution reduction. By extending existing clean energy policies, Wisconsin could reduce its emissions substantially in coming years.

In addition, many of Wisconsin’s most successful companies are leaders in energy efficiency, renewable energy, and clean technology. They are vital sources of innovation and will provide opportunities for the workers of today and tomorrow.

I believe smart investments by government, by companies and institutions, and by citizens will help us confront the challenge of climate change, while positioning Wisconsin for 21st century economic and ecological resiliency.

This opportunity is great. We must meet the challenge head on—going forward the Wisconsin way.

I once again thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his laser focus on this issue that is so critical to all of our home States, as well as, frankly, the entire global community.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank Senator BALDWIN for sharing this time with me this evening, and for all the wonderful work she does on behalf of her home State.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to proceed to S. 625.

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S. 625, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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 S. 625, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Daniel Coats, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, David Vitter, Jerry Moran, Deb Fischer, Johnny Isakson, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Orrin G. Hatch, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Thune.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 625 occur 1

hour after the Senate convenes on Tuesday, March 10.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Prime Minister of Israel shared with the Congress and the American people his perspective regarding Israel's national security interests and the threat the radical regime in Tehran poses to stability in the greater Middle East. The Prime Minister explained later in the day in a meeting here in the Senate why any agreement that leaves Iran with a threshold nuclear weapons capability is harmful not only to the strategic interests of Israel but to the United States and to our allies.

Unfortunately, President Obama appears to be pursuing an agreement that is designed to leave the Iranians with a threshold nuclear capability under which they can retain thousands of centrifuges, continue to master the nuclear fuel cycle, advance ballistic missile research and testing, and keep secret any possible military dimensions of nuclear development that has already occurred. Iran has a record of covertly pursuing aspects of a nuclear weapons program.

The administration has pursued the P5+1 negotiation, not as part of an overall strategy to end Iran's nuclear program and to defeat its efforts to dominate the region but as a stand-alone matter of litigation where a settlement must be reached. This negotiation shouldn't be about getting the best deal the Iranians will agree to; it should be about the strategic objective of ending Iran's nuclear weapons program.

Many in Congress have been wary of what kind of concessions the Obama administration might agree to with the Iranians and what were the responsible steps to be taken if Iran refused to give up the pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability.

Yesterday I began the process to move to legislation that would meet the demands from both sides of the aisle—to give Congress the ability to review and vote on any deal the President agrees to with Iran. From a legislative perspective, given that this bipartisan bill was introduced last week and that the Foreign Relations Committee has ample time to mark up this bill and send a substitute to the floor, I was surprised that some Senators made statements objecting to their own legislation. It was surprising to see some Members on the other side of the aisle threaten to filibuster their own bill—a bill they rushed to introduce before the President's negotiations were complete.

This isn't complicated. A bill was introduced, and, as I discussed with the chairman of the Foreign Relations

Committee, it can be marked up, and the committee-passed bill would be the substitute the Senate then considers.

From a policy perspective, it makes clear to the administration not to strike a deal that leaves Iran as a threshold nuclear state. And it makes obvious sense to consider the Nuclear Review Act before the deadline for a political agreement because the Iranians need to know that congressional sanctions will not be lifted if a bad deal is reached, and some will oppose lifting sanctions if they refuse to disclose the potential military dimensions of their nuclear program.

But, look, time is running out. Iran's Foreign Minister said today that he believes they are very close to a deal.

There is nothing partisan about the Senate acting to serve its constitutional role in oversight and in pursuing policies that uphold the national security interest. It was the Obama administration that decided to negotiate an agreement with Iran that would not be submitted to the Senate as a treaty. The White House went out of its way to bypass the elected representatives of the people in this negotiation with Iran. It is the Obama administration that is negotiating a deal with the Iranians that will leave them with a nuclear infrastructure. And it is the Corker-Graham-Menendez-Kaine bill that will ensure that Congress will review any deal the President strikes with Iran.

So let's be clear. The actions we have taken would allow the sponsors of this sensible, bipartisan legislation to begin the debate next week. And it will allow for the Foreign Relations Committee to follow the regular order and debate and vote on the bill. If the committee reports a bill, the committee bill will become the text that the full Senate debates. That is called the regular order.

It is my sincere hope that the sponsors of this bill will have the opportunity to review and defend their bill in committee and will not filibuster and prevent the full Senate from also acting on their important legislation. The Senators who introduced the bill—who introduced it—should certainly vote to debate the measure.

REMEMBERING DEEDEE CORRADINI

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a truly iconic Utah leader, a remarkable woman, and Salt Lake City's first and only female mayor, Ms. Deedee Corradini.

Sadly, Mayor Corradini lost her short but valiant battle with lung cancer this week. She was a fighter until the end—just as she was in her career and in all aspects of her life.

Deedee was a true trailblazer in every sense. She served as Salt Lake City's mayor for 10 years during a time of significant growth and change. During her tenure, she was instrumental in finalizing the city's bid to host the 2002

Winter Olympics. She aggressively courted economic development and managed transportation infrastructure to ensure that Salt Lake City was prepared to take the world stage.

Always energetic, Mayor Corradini was full of ideas and determination, and she always knew how to get things done.

After her mayoral service, she worked for a time in academia and real estate, but perhaps her greatest personal achievement was her vigorous advocacy of women's ski jumping. She served for 10 years as the president of Women's Ski Jumping USA, where she lobbied tirelessly for the inclusion of women's ski jumping in the Winter Olympic Games. She was able to see her vision realized at the 2014 Sochi Winter Olympics as women ski jumpers dazzled the world in this arena for the first time.

Prior to the Sochi games, she demonstrated her enthusiasm and determination to make this dream come true for women athletes stating:

We've already won. Every single one of the women's ski jumpers, they've already won. . . Our battle to get the women into ski jumping became much more than ski jumping. It really became a women's rights issue and a human rights issue, because we were really fighting for all women in all sports and hopefully all aspects of life.

Deedee helped mentor many women and was an example of hard work, determination, and a will to succeed. Not only did she succeed in her professional pursuits; she was also a loving wife, daughter, sister, and mother.

Mr. President, Elaine and I send our deepest condolences to Deedee's family and friends, and we pray for their peace and comfort at this difficult time. Her influence and legacy will be felt for generations to come. Utah was privileged to develop and grow under her leadership.

KILLING OF RUSSIAN OPPOSITION LEADER BORIS NEMTSOV

Mr. DURBIN. Today I recognize, on the Senate floor, the life and work of a true Russian patriot: Mr. Boris Nemtsov.

Tragically, Mr. Nemtsov was gunned down Friday night as he walked across the Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge with his girlfriend, just yards from the Kremlin and Red Square in central Moscow. Hours before his death, he had given a radio interview where he criticized Russian President Putin for his aggression in Ukraine and Russia's own economic woes—brave acts in a nation where criticism of Putin is not tolerated.

Mr. Nemtsov has been one of the most vocal and highest profile opposition leaders in recent years, tirelessly speaking up for democratic reforms and rights on behalf of the Russian people. In fact, Mr. Nemtsov has been working on behalf of the Russian people for nearly 30 years.

He moved from physics into politics shortly after the Chernobyl disaster in

1986, first winning a seat in the Russian Parliament in 1990. After a series of successful economic reforms as a Parliamentarian and later Governor, Nemtsov was then appointed Deputy Prime Minister under the first President of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin, and even had a chance at the Presidency himself. However, he returned to Parliament after the 1998 crash of the Russian stock market until 2004. Since then, he was active in everything from politics to banking, and over the years he raised repeated concerns that Putin's policies were rolling back democracy and civic freedoms in Russia. Mr. Nemtsov had been arrested several times—and complained of official harassment—for his participation in demonstrations in support of reforms to end corruption, uphold the rule of law, and support basic freedoms.

It is no surprise that tens of thousands of people showed up this Sunday to a rally in Moscow. Originally scheduled to lead the event himself to oppose Russian aggression in Ukraine, the rally turned into an opportunity for members of the opposition movement to mourn Mr. Nemtsov's death. People held images of Mr. Nemtsov, flew flags, and even held up posters and signs with phrases such as: "I am not afraid."

Several thousand also showed up to his funeral Tuesday. Mr. Nemtsov's mother Dina Eidman received all the well-wishers. In recent months, she had reportedly shared her fears that her son may be killed for his criticism of President Putin.

Under President Putin there has been a troubling pattern of silencing peaceful dissent—a problem no doubt made worse by the deliberate whipping up of nationalistic fervor in recent months around Putin's invasion of eastern Ukraine.

We recall the tragic death in prison of Russian human rights lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, jailed for uncovering hundreds of millions of dollars in tax fraud perpetuated by Russian officials in 2009. Mr. Nemtsov had even visited Washington, DC, in 2010 to support the Magnitsky Act.

Some of you may know of Natalya Estemirova or Anna Politkovskaya, two Russian human rights activists and journalists who were outspoken about human rights abuses in Chechnya, and murdered in 2009 and 2006, respectively. There was also the 2006 poisoning in London of Alexander Litvinenko, an FSB officer who defected and made several claims of corruption against Russian law enforcement officials. Incredulously, one of those suspected for his murder by British authorities was later elected to the Russian Parliament. Sadly, the list goes on.

More recently, the nationalistic passions unleashed by the annexation of Crimea and Sevastopol last year has led to more narrowing of free speech and the marginalization of activists.

Many have faced harassment, prison sentences, even violence. And in many of these types of cases, perpetrators are not brought to justice. In a country where authorities may sometimes be involved in crimes of their own and where law enforcement, judicial, and investigative bodies lack credibility, there is very little accountability.

What has been happening in eastern Ukraine and Russia is deeply troubling. President Putin has used the invasion of Ukraine to justify a further crackdown on his own people's talents and aspirations. He has used state-controlled media to unleash anti-Western propaganda that is an insult to the Russia people. He has bet his people's economic and international standing on the pursuit and protection of his own kleptocracy. The Russian people deserve better.

In the case of Mr. Nemtsov, I echo the words of President Obama and countless others: an independent investigation must take place to find out who was responsible for Mr. Nemtsov's death, and the perpetrators must be swiftly brought to justice. The same goes for the many others who had the courage to peacefully report the truth or voice dissent in Russia and then found themselves in jail or murdered.

I joined Senator JOHNSON this week in leading a resolution recognizing Boris Nemtsov and calling for an investigation. I urge my colleagues to support this hero who has been taken from us too soon, and I hope we can continue to work in his honor to support the Russian people as they stand for democratic reforms.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, next week the Nation will celebrate the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, when we commemorate the series of marches of nonviolent civil rights protestors from Selma to the Alabama State capital of Montgomery. They were marching for the right to vote, which had been guaranteed by the adoption of the 15th Amendment to the Constitution in 1870. The first section of the amendment reads: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

These marches gripped the attention of the Nation because of the violence reaction from the Alabama State troopers, who attacked the marchers on the Edmund Pettus Bridge after leaving Selma. The State troopers attacked the marchers using billy clubs, tear gas, fire hoses, and dogs, and numerous marchers were wounded and were beaten unconscious.

The images shown on television galvanized the American public in support of voting rights. President Lyndon Johnson called on Congress to enact voting rights legislation and make

good on both the promise of the 15th Amendment as well as the responsibility of Congress to enforce the amendment “by appropriate legislation.”

One of those protestors beaten on the bridge was a Freedom Rider, speaker at the March on Washington, and a leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordination Committee. That protestor was JOHN LEWIS.

I was honored and privileged to enter Congress in 1987 at the same time as Congressman JOHN LEWIS. JOHN LEWIS has been a friend and mentor of mine for many years and is known as the “conscience of the Congress.” And while I did leave the House in 2006 to enter the Senate in 2007, I have continued to be inspired by Congressman LEWIS and his continuing struggle to make sure all Americans enjoy the benefits of equal justice under the law.

Just last week during Black History Month, I had the honor, along with Congressman JOHN LEWIS, to address a group of students from Baltimore who took their own pilgrimage to Selma as we approach the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday.

High School students and teachers from Park School, Baltimore City College, City Neighbors High School, and Cristo Rey Jesuit High School participated in a trip to southern cities such as Greensboro, Atlanta, Selma, Little Rock, the Mississippi Delta, and Memphis, focusing on the civil rights movement.

I wish to share some of the stories that the students told to Congressman LEWIS and me last week, because their idealism, determination, and knowledge of both the past and present is very inspirational.

Let me begin with a brief history of how this trip came into being. In 2004, the first group of students and faculty from the Park School of Baltimore and Baltimore City College High School traveled throughout the American South, visiting with participants in the Civil Rights Movement and touring the museums, sites, and memorials that stand in witness to the foot soldiers, heroes, and martyrs of the movement. The trip was the dream of three Park School faculty members: Carol Kinne, Traci Wright, and Stradine Harris. They envisioned young people from different schools and different backgrounds learning together and becoming inspired to be agents of change upon their return.

Money to cover the expenses of the trip is raised each year by the students. They sell pizza and candy, rake leaves, write grant proposals, and solicit funds from various benefactors.

While learning about the Civil Rights Movement is a primary goal of the trip, equally important is inspiring students to raise awareness of civil rights issues facing people today and to become activists for justice in their own communities.

In 2015, four Baltimore schools—City Neighbors and Cristo Rey having joined

the original two—sent 38 students on the trip.

The January 2015 trip was a special one, as the group had the chance to meet with former Ambassador Andrew Young in Atlanta and to attend an event for the movie, *Selma*, that took place on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, in honor of the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday.

The group also visited the International Civil Rights Center in Greensboro, NC, attended church service at Ebenezer Baptist Church, toured the Rosa Parks Museum, met with activists at the Equal Justice Initiative and the Southern Poverty Law Center, and learned about the movement in other museums in Birmingham, Memphis, and Little Rock. More importantly, the group was able to meet and learn from people who fought for change: Cleopatra Goree, Catherine Burks-Brooks, Kurt Carrington, Roscoe Jones, Dr. Sybil Hampton, and others.

I wish to share just a few of the many stories from students who went on this trip, as related in their blog:

Amber Smiley is a 12th grader at Cristo Rey. Amber wrote:

Across from the museum was this statue of people being attacked by dogs and hit with high amounts of pressured water. In these statues you could see the emotion in every one of them. You could see the fit and the drive to make changes. After leaving we had lunch with 3 women that marched, taught, and fought for rights. The women's names are Ms. Cleopatra Goree, Ms. Catherine Burks-Brooks, and Ms. Mimes. Each one of their stories varied but all built up to the bigger theme that we have to strive to make the world better. These words stuck with me like glue on two pieces of paper. Also, they said it's our turn to make a change its make thing about how can each school community to come and make a change in Baltimore. These women impacted my life and the whole group to change the injustices in our world. I was really honored to have them come and give us these points of views and life stories. It was really a blessing.

Latonyah Williams is a 12th grader at City Neighbors. She wrote:

At the Little Rock Central visitor center, I found a quote that immediately grabbed my attention as I walked through the doors. It goes “If not us, then who? If not now, then when?”—John Lewis. It grabbed at me because it shows the mindset behind how the leaders were thinking back when they were fighting for our rights. They weren't thinking of themselves or their lives, but of the future and the many generations to come. So now I want to have the mindset of if not me, then who will take a stand? If not now, then most likely it will not ever happen.

I am confident that this trip continues to impact students long after they return to Baltimore.

So today, while we recognize the achievements and accomplishments of heroes like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Rosa Parks, Thurgood Marshall, and JOHN LEWIS, we cannot shy away from the painful history of race relations in our country. To do so would be a disservice to all those who struggled and sacrificed in the name of equality.

Slavery and segregation were dark and painful chapters in American his-

tory, and those abhorrent practices occurred in Maryland and throughout the rest of our Nation.

Today, we must confront the issue of racial profiling. Racial profiling is the practice of discriminatory profiling based on race, ethnicity, religion or any other stereotype, and it is a matter that needs to be addressed from its root causes.

I ask: how many more cases like Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, and Eric Garner must we have? How many more families will have to suffer until we get this right?

It has been heartbreaking to see several other American towns—from Ferguson, MO, to New York City, gripped by such a tragedies that resulted from racial profiling. Eighteen-year old Michael Brown was just days away from starting his first college classes, but he no longer has the chance to pursue his dreams.

In the Senate I have introduced the End Racial Profiling Act. This legislation is a step in the direction of ensuring equal treatment of all people under the law, conserving resources, and restoring trust in the men and women who risk their lives by signing up to protect our communities.

Racial profiling is un-American. It has no place within the values of our country. It turns communities against the partnerships needed to keep our neighborhoods safe.

Racial profiling is defined in a standard, consistent definition as the practice of a law enforcement agent relying on race, ethnicity, religion or national origin as a factor in their investigations and activities.

The legislation I have introduced creates an exception for the use of these factors where there is trustworthy information, relevant to the locality and time frame, which links persons of a particular race, ethnicity or national origin to an identified incident or scheme.

Law enforcement agencies would be prohibited from using racial profiling in criminal or routine law enforcement investigations, immigration enforcement, and national security cases.

The legislation I have introduced is supported by a broad coalition of civil rights groups such as the NAACP, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, ACLU, Rights Working Group, ACLU, and numerous other national, State, and local organizations.

While some may predict further gridlock and political polarization with a Congress led by one party and the President of another, I firmly believe that we will find ways to work together on the issues most important to the American public—and racial profiling is clearly one of those issues. Congress overwhelmingly reauthorized the Voting Rights Act in 2006 after building an extensive record that made a compelling case for the continued need to protect minority voters from discrimination.

As much as we wish it wasn't so, racism has not disappeared from America

and there continue to be individuals and groups who would use our voting system to deliberately minimize the rights of minority voters. Congress should act to revitalize the Voting Rights Act.

Protecting the right to vote also extends to restoring the rights of nearly 4 million Americans across the country who have been released from prison but barred from the voting booth, often for life. I have been leading the fight for the Democracy Restoration Act, which would restore voting rights to individuals after they have served their time and have been released from incarceration.

If we truly want to break the cycle of recidivism, we need to reintegrate former prisoners back into society. When prisoners are released, they are expected to obey the law, get a job, and pay taxes as they are rehabilitated and reintegrated into their community. With these responsibilities and obligations of citizenship should also come the rights of citizenship, including the right to vote.

The current patchwork of State laws results in the lack of a uniform standard for eligibility to vote in Federal elections.

I believe that Congress should take strong action now to remedy this problem and enact a nationwide standard for restoration of voting rights. That is why I have introduced the Democracy Restoration Act.

As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, let us continue the march for justice for all Americans. I urge Congress to address the issues of voting rights and racial profiling during this session.

CENTENNIAL OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, yesterday marked the centennial of the U.S. Navy Reserve, an indispensable and valuable part of our Armed Forces. The Navy Reserve was established as the Naval Reserve on March 3, 1915, and since then sailors have served in every conflict from World War I to the present. In addition, five U.S. Presidents: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, and George H.W. Bush have all served honorably in the Navy Reserve.

Today, we have more than 2,000 Navy Reserve sailors deployed around the world and our country is extremely grateful for the contributions and sacrifices that these sailors have made and continue to make to the history of the United States.

LIEUTENANT MICHAEL GRABOWSKI

One of those sailors I would like to talk about today is LT Michael Grabowski from Norwalk, CT. Lieutenant Grabowski is a perfect example of the student-citizen-soldier who wears two uniforms, one protecting the people of my State and the other honorably protecting our soldiers overseas. As a civilian, Lieutenant Grabowski

serves in the Connecticut State Police and is one of six servicemembers of the Connecticut State Police currently mobilized by our Armed Forces. In addition, he is a first-year law student at Quinnipiac University. Michael is currently mobilized to Qatar supporting Operation Enduring Freedom as a master of arms in the Navy. Michael is a fine example of the courage and sacrifice that citizens of Connecticut and all across the country have made to protect our freedoms.

Today we celebrate Michael and every sailor and their families' commitment and service; and encourage all Americans to seize the opportunity to honor and support these brave men and women.

ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks to the Association of Private Sector Colleges and Universities.

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

ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Our nation is home to the world's greatest system of colleges and universities. From the beginning, federal policy has been to give grants and loans to students and let them choose from among all types of institutions—public four-year universities, community colleges, for-profit colleges, and private non-profits.

For example, students can study automobile technology at Nashville's auto diesel school or forensic psychology at Argosy University or computer information systems at DeVry University.

Student choice and competition are the drivers of American higher education's success. And an important participant in American higher education has always been our for-profit colleges and universities.

The students served by for-profit colleges underscore their importance. Nearly 2,100 institutions educate 3.3 million students representing, approximately 12 percent of all college enrollments, 1.8 million Pell students and 1.9 million federal loan borrowers. More than half of enrollments are students of color. Fifty percent of students are juggling school with children. More than a third of these students are working full-time while going to school. For-profits accounted for 44 percent of certificates, 20 percent of two-year associate's degrees and 7 percent of bachelor's degrees granted in the United States in 2012.

The President along with many governors and state legislatures are setting goals to increase the number of citizens with college degrees or certificates. Governor Haslam in Tennessee has an ambitious goal called Drive to 55, to see 55 percent of Tennesseans with degrees or certificates by 2025. The president has called for America to have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world by 2020.

The only way to achieve these goals is to include all sectors of higher education, including for-profit colleges and universities. Yet this administration has taken aim at the for-profit sector, and has created regulations specifically targeting your colleges and universities.

My view is that our policies should equally apply to all institutions of higher education, no matter the sector. There are bad apples in the for-profit sector—but there are bad apples in every sector of higher education.

So let me begin to describe my priorities for all sectors of higher education, which includes your colleges and universities:

- 1) Make it easier for students to go to college (FAST Act)
- 2) Make it simpler for colleges and universities to educate (Task Force on Regulation)
- 3) Make sure that accreditation ensures quality (Accreditation)
- 4) Make it harder to overborrow (FAST Act, Skin in the Game)
- 5) Make sure colleges are collecting useful data for students, families and policymakers (Consumer Data)

These are my priorities as we work over the next few months to reauthorize this law and ensure that 20 years from now, our colleges and universities still remain the best in the world in the quality of education they provide.

Number one, make it simpler for colleges and universities to educate. Today we have a government form so complicated and confusing that it discourages as many as 2 million Americans from attending college each year. This is the dreaded FAFSA—the Free Application for Federal Student Aid—which consists of 108 questions on topics ranging from your spouse's federal tax exemptions to the net worth of your parents' investment farms.

I have joined with a bipartisan group of senators to introduce legislation that would simplify the FAFSA form to just two questions—1) What was your household income two years ago? 2) What is your family size?

Four experts before our committee testified that these two questions would provide about 95 percent of all the information the federal government needs to determine award amounts.

It would also make the process, as much as the questions, less intimidating for parents. Because our bill would ask for household income from two years ago—as opposed to last year's income—it would restore sanity to the parents of applicants who are often being asked to provide the government with their income totals before they've even received their W-2s for the year.

One mentor with Governor Haslam's Tennessee Promise program, a woman named Cathy Hammon, says the form has a "chilling effect"—intimidating parents who may themselves never have attended college, and have no experience navigating the process. She says this: "It's the very youth we worry about the most that struggle with it."

The FAST Act would also restore year-round Pell availability. This gives students common-sense flexibility. According to a study by New America, under today's Pell schedule: "If a student attends a college that treats the summer as the start of the year, receives Pell Grants as a full-time student in that summer, and then attends full-time in the fall, she will not have enough aid to attend full-time in the spring." That doesn't make sense and it doesn't help students. So our proposal would let them use Pell all year.

Number two, make it simpler for colleges and universities to educate.

Over a year ago, Vanderbilt University hired the Boston Consulting Group to determine how much it costs the university to comply with federal rules and regulations. The answer: \$150 million, or 11 percent of the university's total non-hospital expenditures last year. Vanderbilt Chancellor Nick Zeppos says that this adds about \$11,000 in additional tuition per year for each of the university's 12,757 students.

The Higher Education Act totals nearly 1,000 pages; there are over 1,000 pages in the official Code of Federal Regulations devoted to higher education; and on average every workday the Department of Education issues one new sub-regulatory guidance directive or clarification. No one has taken the time to “weed the garden.”

The result of this piling up of regulations is that one of the greatest obstacles to innovation and cost consciousness in higher education has become—us, the federal government.

A conspicuous example of this is the Gainful Employment regulation. It's a perfect symbol of what's wrong with our regulatory process that the Administration needed nearly 945 pages to define a two-word phrase that has been in the higher education law in one form or another since 1965.

What's especially concerning about the regulation is—

First, the rule is designed to almost exclusively impact and penalize for-profit colleges and universities. It selectively ignores concerns about student loan debt levels across all sectors of higher education.

The Department of Education's own National Center for Education Statistics reports that 26% of graduates from public, four-year colleges and 39% of graduates from private, four-year colleges would not be considered “gainfully employed” using the Department's metrics. It seems ridiculous that this regulation could shut down a nursing program at a for-profit institution but not one in exactly the same circumstances at a non-profit or public institution.

Second, the rule's complex debt-to-income ratios over-emphasize a graduate's income right after college. This is especially shortsighted for educational programs that hold an important public benefit such as education or social work, but don't result in early-career, high-paying salaries.

Third, this regulation has nothing to do with the quality of the education being provided. It simply relies on arbitrary government definitions of affordable student loan debt. What would be the result? More than 800,000 students will be kicked out of their programs at a time when many public colleges are unable to accommodate more students.

This simply isn't a good regulation and I think the Administration knows I'll do what it takes to oppose it. I've sponsored legislation by Richard Burr and Virginia Foxx to overturn the gainful employment regulation, and other regulations that are equally ill advised. I led a letter signed by several of my colleagues opposing the proposed regulations, and I am prepared to offer an amendment to restrict funds from being used to implement the rule. As we approach the rewrite of the Higher Education Act, I intend to do what I can to prohibit the Department from implementing this regulation and treat all institutions equally.

This is just one example of regulatory excess.

And when it comes to bad regulations, let me make clear: we cannot just blame President Obama and Education Secretary Arne Duncan. They have contributed to the problem, but so has every president and every education secretary—and that includes me—since 1965 when the first Higher Education Act was enacted.

More than a year ago, four members of the Senate education committee—two Democrats and two Republicans—asked a group of distinguished educators to examine the current state of federal rules and regulations for colleges and universities. We asked them not just to tell us the problem, but to give us specific solutions.

They last month sent to us, “Recalibrating Regulation of Colleges and Universities,” a

remarkable report in which they outline 59 specific regulations, requirements and areas for Congress and the Department of Education to consider—listing 10 especially problematic regulations. In their own words, America's 6,000 colleges and universities live in a “jungle of red tape” that is expensive and confusing and unnecessary.

So with this reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Ranking Member Murray and I will work on a process that takes full advantage of the recommendations in this report so we can include many of them in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

But the bottom line is that regulations are taking good money away from educating students and performing research and all sorts of other things colleges and universities ought to be doing.

We won't let that happen again with this reauthorization.

Number three, make sure that accreditation ensures quality.

Our higher education system today is governed by what's known as the “triad”:

The federal government, which ensures that colleges and universities have the fiscal and administrative capability to participate in federal aid programs.

The state governments—governor, legislature, state boards of education—that authorize institutions of higher education, oversee public institutions, and provide substantial public funding.

Finally, and perhaps most important, is the accreditation system.

The system also has one other major check, the student consumer—who is able to choose from over 6,000 colleges and universities, and ideally is unlikely to waste their time and money on a worthless degree. When it comes to ensuring academic quality—the choice is this: Either we have Washington regulate our over 6,000 colleges and universities, or we let them self-regulate through accreditation. I much prefer accreditation.

That does not mean our system of accreditation is problem-free. Today, accreditors meddle in areas that are none of their business. And sometimes they're too stuffy to allow some of the innovation that needs to come in education. We need to take a hard look at the system and the role it serves for the American taxpayer.

We need to answer questions, such as: Are accreditors focused on the right things such as student learning and quality?

Does the current structure of regional accreditation make sense in today's world when higher education is increasingly national in scope?

Are federal rules and regulations on accreditors getting in the way of their ability to assess and ensure academic quality?

But we need to keep in mind that this system is far preferable to any regulatory body created by the federal government.

Number four, make it harder for students to over-borrow.

There's a lot of discussion about student debt in the United States, but when you drill down on who's really got so much debt: It's a very small contingent of mostly graduate students. For most Americans, college is a good investment that will pay off.

Three out of four of our college students attend a public 2- or 4-year college and university. Of those, about two out of five of all students attend community colleges where the average tuition and fees are under \$3,300. Those students receive an average of \$4,850 in grants and scholarships. So the average community college student in America is receiving about \$1,500 more in grants and scholarships than what it costs in tuition and fees to attend college.

Thirty-seven percent of all of our college students attend public 4-year universities.

The average in-state tuition and fees is about \$8,900. Those students receive in average \$5,800 in grants and scholarships. We're not talking loans, so they have to pay \$3,100 on average, in tuition and fees.

And then we have students who attend 4-year colleges that are private. That's about 15 percent. Their average tuition and fees are \$30,000 but the scholarships and grants take that down to \$12,500. At for-profit colleges and universities, the average cost is about \$15,000.

About 2 percent of federal borrowers have more than \$100,000 in debt. Graduate students are typically the problem.

The FAST Act would discourage over-borrowing by limiting the amount a graduate student is able to borrow. It would also help undergraduates from borrowing too much, by limiting borrowing based on enrollment. For example, a part-time student would be able to take out a part time loan only.

In addition, my proposal would allow institutions to limit borrowing based on evidence that students completing the program have difficulty repaying their loans.

I would also like to give schools more ability to counsel students on borrowing. Many in Congress are concerned with students borrowing more than is necessary while attending college and anecdotal examples of increased institutional counseling has led to reduced borrowing by students.

I believe that the institution, especially if we give you the ability to counsel students and limit borrowing, should bear some responsibility for this borrowing—after all you are the ones charging these students. However, I am seeking your input on this topic. Some of your members, as well as the association itself, have talked with me and my staff about this topic. I hope those discussions continue.

Number five, make sure the data colleges are collecting are useful for students, families and policymakers.

Before we rewrite this law, we need to know what information consumers actually find useful as they shop for schools, how much information is too much and what is the role of the federal government.

The federal government collects thousands of data points annually on schools, yet still cannot answer some of policymakers and students basic questions. In the future, Department of Education should only collect data that is useful to consumers or to policymakers regarding how well our federal programs are working. Consumers nor policymakers are able to absorb all of the data currently collected.

This is a prime area to reduce institutional burden. So we need to determine what information is truly needed. That may mean collecting new and different data that better fulfills federal responsibilities to taxpayers and drives the free market which makes our country and higher education system number one.

It is also important to ensure that the Department is not allowed to manipulate this data to create opaque, inappropriate or contrived metrics such as recently happened with cohort default rates and gainful employment, and will more than likely occur in the forthcoming ratings system.

I look forward to the upcoming reauthorization. Senator MURRAY and I are working very well in moving a fix to No Child Left Behind and I see no reason why the Higher Education Act will be any different. I intend to move to this bill this spring after we complete Senate action on No Child Left Behind. We will hold several hearings before holding a mark-up of a reauthorization early this summer. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the process unfolds. Thank you for everything you have done to be helpful so far and for providing opportunity to those seeking a higher education.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JEFFREY SHAW

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Jeffrey Shaw on his retirement after serving Southwest Gas Corporation, Southwest Gas, for 27 years. It gives me great pleasure to recognize his years of hard work and dedication to a company that services thousands across Nevada.

Mr. Shaw stands as a shining example of someone who has devoted his life to serving his State and community. After earning his bachelor of science in accounting from the University of Utah, Mr. Shaw worked for Arthur Andersen & Co. in its Dallas and Las Vegas offices in the audit division. In 1988, he began his career at Southwest Gas as director of internal audit. From there, Mr. Shaw worked to move higher in the company, climbing from controller and chief accounting officer all the way to president and chief executive officer of Southwest Gas. Today, the company services over 1 million homes across the country.

Mr. Shaw is not only driven in his endeavors with Southwest Gas, but within the local Las Vegas community as well. He is a member of the Nevada Society of Certified Public Accountants and the Leadership Las Vegas Alumni Association. He also serves on the boards of the Council for a Better Nevada and the UNLV Foundation, and he is a past president and a current board member of both the Western Energy Institute and the Las Vegas Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America. His work throughout these many organizations demonstrates his dedication to honorably representing Nevada on multiple fronts. Although he is retiring, his legacy within these organizations will continue for years to come.

It is not only Mr. Shaw's commitment and drive to excel that places him among the most notable in his community, but also his genuine good nature in helping others. He has served Las Vegas by contributing to higher education and the local Boy Scout community, and by working to improve the quality of life across the State. His commitment to helping those around him is unwavering.

I am very grateful for his dedication to the people of Las Vegas and to the State of Nevada. He exemplifies the highest standards of leadership and community service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. Today, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Shaw on his retirement, and I give my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make Nevada a better place. I offer him my best wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DONALDO MCINTOSH

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Donald McIntosh on his retirement after 58 years of service

to Nevada and to the country. His hard work and dedication throughout the years is honorable.

Mr. McIntosh started his career in 1957 as a military police officer in the U.S. Army. His service extended for 3 years, protecting those in his local community, as well as his country. After serving in the Army, Mr. McIntosh then spent the rest of his career working in the transportation industry for the city of Las Vegas. In 1970, he worked as safety director for the Las Vegas Transit System and Greyline Tours and then for Transportation Unlimited. His final years of service were spent as a transportation escort for the Pahrump Senior Center.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. McIntosh for his courageous contributions to the United States of America. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. 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 after their service. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

The Las Vegas community has greatly benefitted from the hard work of Mr. McIntosh. Today, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. McIntosh on his retirement. I offer my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make the Silver State a better place and for his service to this country, and I give my best wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and a withdrawal, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE DESIGNATION OF FUNDING FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM—PM 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with language under the heading "Coast Guard, Operating Expenses" of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (the "Act"), I hereby designate for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism all funding so designated by the Congress in the Act pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, as outlined in the enclosed list of accounts.

The details of this action are set forth in the enclosed memorandum from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 2015.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:55 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, and that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the aforementioned bill.

The message also announced that pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee: Mr. DELANEY of Maryland, Ms. ADAMS of North Carolina, and Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:14 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 240. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

H.R. 431. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 625. A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with

accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-814. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Cattle Fever Tick; Importation Requirements for Ruminants From Mexico” ((RIN)0579-AD91) (Docket No. APHIS-2012-0073) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-815. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “9-Octadecenoic Acid (9Z)-, Sulfonated, Oxidized and its Potassium and Sodium Salts; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9922-29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-816. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Metaldehyde; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9921-85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-817. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “2015 Report to Congress from the Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Advisory Committee”; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-818. A communication from the Vice President of Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak, transmitting, pursuant to law, Amtrak’s fiscal year 2016 General and Legislative Annual Report; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-819. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Establishing Transit Areas Through Walrus Protection Areas at Round Island and Cape Peirce, Northern Bristol Bay, Alaska; Amendment 107” (RIN)0648-BE24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-820. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Protection System Maintenance Reliability Standard” (RIN)1902-AE88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-821. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-822. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Significant New Use Rule for Pentane, 1,1,1,2,3,3-hexafluoro-4-(1,1,2,3,3,3-hexafluoropropoxy)-” ((RIN)2070) (FRL No. 9922-30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the

Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-823. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Emissions Statement Requirement for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard” (FRL No. 9923-94-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-824. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (FRL No. 9924-16-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-825. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi: New Source Review - Prevention of Significance Deterioration” (FRL No. 9923-92-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-826. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Revisions for the Regulation and Permitting of Fine Particulate Matter” (FRL No. 9923-77-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-827. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Approval of Substitution for Transportation Control Measures” (FRL No. 9923-80-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-828. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Georgia; Redesignation of the Rome, Georgia, 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment; Correction” (FRL No. 9923-89-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-829. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; State Boards Requirements; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide, and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (FRL No. 9924-02-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-830. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (FRL No. 9923-79-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-831. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan for the Reading, Pennsylvania Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard, and 2007 Base Year Inventory” (FRL No. 9923-11-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-832. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri” (FRL No. 9923-68-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-833. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approval and Promulgation: Missouri; St. Louis Inspection and Maintenance Program” (FRL No. 9923-66-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-834. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Round 2 of Section 48A Phase III Program under the Qualifying Advanced Coal Project Program” (Notice 2015-14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-835. A communication from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2015 Trade Policy Agenda and 2014 Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-836. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office’s audit of the United States government’s fiscal years 2014 and 2013 consolidated financial statements; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-837. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-838. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans; Supplemental Final Rule” (RIN)3133-AE21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate

on March 2, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-839. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans" (RIN1333-AE04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-840. A communication from the Director, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Executive Order 13672 Prohibiting Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity by Contractors and Subcontractors" (RIN1250-AA07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-841. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Device Reporting: Electronic Submission Requirements; Correcting Amendments" ((RIN0910-AF86) (Docket No. FDA-2008-N-0393)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-842. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-068); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-843. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-131); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-844. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-150); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-845. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015-0018-2015-0025); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-846. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking (OSS-2015-0220); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-847. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration and Designated Reporting Official, Office on National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of National Drug Control Policy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-7. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan supporting scientific

ally-based state management of gray wolves and calling for legislative action by the U.S. Congress in an effort to remove the Western Great Lakes gray wolf population from the endangered and threatened species list; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, On December 19, 2014, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia returned the Western Great Lakes population of gray wolves to the federal endangered and threatened species list. This is the third time in the last decade that federal courts have disregarded the judgment of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service scientists and overturned a delisting of the gray wolf in the Great Lakes regions; and

Whereas, Based on objective scientific criteria, gray wolves have made a remarkable recovery from near extinction and are no and longer endangered in Michigan. Michigan's gray wolf population exceeds by more than three times the number or wolves biologists consider necessary to maintain a healthy population and has grown steadily for more than a decade. Michigan's wolf population has met all federal recovery goals for delisting, both in terms of the number of wolves and the stability of those numbers; and

Whereas, The extreme protection afforded gray wolves under the federal Endangered Species Act prevents sound management of this species in Michigan. Gray wolves increasingly endanger people and domestic animals as they encroach more and more on developed areas, and they also impact other wildlife. In 2014, deadly wolf attacks on livestock and dogs increased 75 percent in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. As a result of the court's decision, Michigan's laws allowing citizens to protect their valuable livestock and dogs from wolves have been invalidated. The federal law was designed to bring back species from the brink of extinction, not manage the complicated interactions between people and an increasingly large and expanding predator population; and

Whereas, Michigan is well-prepared to manage gray wolves. The state of Michigan has developed a scientifically-based management plan that will continue to maintain a healthy gray wolf population while allowing for more flexibility when conflicts between people and wolves arise. This plan will allow the state to meet its obligations under sections 51 and 52 of the Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963 to protect the public health and natural resources in the interest of the general welfare of the people; and

Whereas, Michigan cannot properly manage the gray wolf population until gray wolves are removed from the federal endangered and threatened species list in the Great Lakes region. The federal courts' continued interference infringes on this state's rights under the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and the U.S. District Court's ruling must be overturned or the fundamental flaws in the federal Endangered Species Act corrected so that science and reason can prevail; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we support scientifically-based state management of gray wolves by the Michigan Natural Resources Commission and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources; and be it further

Resolved, That to achieve that end, we support federal legislation to lift federal protections on the Western Great Lakes gray wolf population so they are no longer considered endangered, and we call on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to appeal the recent federal court ruling that returned gray wolves in the Great Lakes region to the fed-

eral endangered and threatened species list; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, the director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Michigan Natural Resources Commission, and the director of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources.

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 and Mr. BROWN):

S. 648. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve formulary requirements for prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans with respect to certain categories or classes of drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 649. A bill to amend the eligibility requirements for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 650. A bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 651. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 652. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 653. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 654. A bill to exempt certain class A CDL drivers from the requirement to obtain a hazardous material endorsement while operating a service vehicle with a fuel tank containing 3,785 liters (1,000 gallons) or less of diesel fuel; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 655. A bill to prohibit the use of funds by the Secretary of the Interior to make a final determination on the listing of the northern long-eared bat under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 656. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable

State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to all veterans with a serious service-connected injury eligibility to participate in the family caregiver services program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 658. A bill to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 659. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a credit for married couples who are both employed and have young children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the dependent care tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 662. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 663. A bill to repeal the violation of sovereign nations' laws and privacy matters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 664. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a tax credit for foster families; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 665. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 666. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the treatment of medical evidence provided by non-Depart-

ment of Veterans Affairs medical professionals in support of claims for disability compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEE, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 667. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 668. A bill to require data brokers to establish procedures to ensure the accuracy of collected personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 669. A bill to provide for consideration of legislation to respond to a violation by Iran of an arrangement relating to its nuclear program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 670. A bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 671. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to strengthen elementary and secondary computer science education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 672. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to support a reduction in school suspension and expulsions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 673. A bill to provide a transition plan for those individuals who may be affected by ObamaCare's unlawful implementation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 674. A bill to expand programs with respect to women's health; 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. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. Res. 96. A resolution condemning the murder of Boris Nemtsov, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KIRK, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 97. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 98. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Con. Res. 8. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative stamp honoring the 50th anniversary of the three civil rights marches from Selma, Alabama to Montgomery, Alabama that took place over the course of several weeks in March 1965; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. REID (for Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. COATS)):

S. Con. Res. 9. A concurrent resolution honoring the life and memory of Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president emeritus of the University of Notre Dame; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 125

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 125, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 166, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 256

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) 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. 322

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

S. 332

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 338, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 441, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale,

manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 511

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 511, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients to be labeled accordingly.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 552

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 552, a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide for increased limitations on leverage for multiple licenses under common control.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to marshal resources to undertake a concerted, transformative effort that seeks to bring an end to modern slavery, and for other purposes.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 568, a bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan

(Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 588

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 588, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to establish a consumer product safety standard for liquid detergent packets to protect children under the age of five from injury or illness, and for other purposes.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to prohibit baiting exemptions on certain land.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 638, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to exceptional event demonstrations, and for other purposes.

S. 639

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 639, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to include in any proposed rule that limits greenhouse gas emissions and imposes increased costs on other Federal agencies an offset from funds available to the Administrator for all projected increased costs that the proposed rule would impose on other Federal agencies.

S. 640

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 640, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the review and revision of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders.

S. RES. 93

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 93, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the courageous work and life of Russian opposition leader Boris Nemtsov, and calling for a swift and transparent

investigation into his tragic murder in Moscow on February 27, 2015.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 653. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Water Resources Research Amendments Act. First authorized in 1964, the Water Resources Research Act established 54 Water Resources Research Institutes at top land grant universities in each of the 50 States and the U.S. territories. These institutes created a grant program and provided opportunities for applied water supply research. The bill I introduce today would reauthorize the grant program for the next 5 years and would add a program focused on research and development of green infrastructure.

Water and the availability thereof is a defining characteristic of U.S. landscape, culture, wealth, and security. Clean water is a relatively rare and invaluable resource. Last year's funded projects included research into the impacts of climate change on water supply lakes, the development of better detection methods for pathogens in drinking water, and the impacts of drought on farm supply chains. In my own State, some of the tools we use for restoration of the Chesapeake Bay were products of these same grants in previous years. WRRRA Researchers across the Mid-Atlantic States have developed ways to keep the Chesapeake waters cleaner through urban stormwater treatment, improved roadway design, and eco-friendly poultry farming practices. WRRRA-funded projects develop innovative and cost-effective solutions for similar water resources issues across the country. Undoubtedly, funding WRRRA is an intelligent and necessary investment in the future of our water resources.

WRRRA authorizes two types of annual grants. First, it supplies grants to each Water Resources Research Institute for research that fosters improvements in water supply reliability, explores new ways to address water problems, encourages dissemination of research to water managers and the public, and encourages the entry of new scientists, engineers and technicians into the water resources field. Second, WRRRA authorizes a national competitive grant program to address regional water issues. All WRRRA grants leverage non-federal dollars at a minimum ratio of 2 to 1, but often far beyond that level, as high as 5 to 1.

The Water Resources Research Act was most recently reauthorized in 2006, in PL 109-471. In that period, the pro-

gram was authorized at \$12,000,000 per year, providing \$6,000,000 each to state and competitive project grants. Authorization for these grants expired in fiscal year 2011. Today's bill would reauthorize both grant programs for an additional 5 years by providing \$7,500,000 for institutional grants and \$1,500,000 for national competitive grants. This lower authorization level reflects our efforts to adjust for present fiscal limitations. The proposed authorization maximizes the economic efficiency of the program without compromising its efficacy. An independent review panel has judged that the Water Resources Research Institutes command significant funding leverage for the modest amount of appropriations required to support it. Thus, we can be sure that we are supporting top-notch science while maximizing cost-effectiveness. Moreover, by funding this network of institutes we are investing in our future. The Water Resources Research Institutes are the country's single largest training program for water scientists, technicians, and engineers.

Today, floods, droughts, and water degradation issues pervade the nation. Simultaneously, water resources are increasingly critical for production of resources, economic stability, and the health and well-being of the citizenry. WRRRA grants provide us with improved understanding of water-related issues and better technology to address them. Nearly half a century after the Water Resources Research grant program was first put in place, this program is relevant, critical, and deserving of our support.

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. 653

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Research Amendments Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.—Section 102 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10301) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (9) as paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated), by striking "and" at the end; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) additional research is required into increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of new and existing treatment works through alternative approaches, including—

"(A) nonstructural alternatives;

"(B) decentralized approaches;

"(C) energy use efficiency;

"(D) water use efficiency; and

"(E) actions to extract energy from wastewater;"

(b) CLARIFICATION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—Section 104(b)(1) of the Water Re-

sources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking "water-related phenomena" and inserting "water resources"; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and".

(c) COMPLIANCE REPORT.—Section 104(c) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(c) From the" and inserting the following:

"(c) GRANTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—From the"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 31 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a report regarding the compliance of each funding recipient with this subsection for the immediately preceding fiscal year."

(d) EVALUATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 104 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303) is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

"(e) EVALUATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a careful and detailed evaluation of each institute at least once every 3 years to determine—

"(A) the quality and relevance of the water resources research of the institute;

"(B) the effectiveness of the institute at producing measured results and applied water supply research; and

"(C) whether the effectiveness of the institute as an institution for planning, conducting, and arranging for research warrants continued support under this section.

"(2) PROHIBITION ON FURTHER SUPPORT.—If, as a result of an evaluation under paragraph (1), the Secretary determines that an institute does not qualify for further support under this section, no further grants to the institute may be provided until the qualifications of the institute are reestablished to the satisfaction of the Secretary."

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 104(f)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(f)(1)) is amended by striking "\$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011" and inserting "\$7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020".

(f) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS WHERE RESEARCH FOCUSED ON WATER PROBLEMS OF INTERSTATE NATURE.—Section 104(g)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(g)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "\$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011" and inserting "\$1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020".

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to all veterans with a serious service-connected injury eligibility to participate in the family caregiver services program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce a bill today along with Senator BALDWIN that will help veterans and the men and women who care for them. Called the Caregivers

Expansion and Improvement Act, it would open the VA Family Caregivers Program to all eligible veterans who were severely injured while serving our country.

I introduced legislation creating the Family Caregiver Program in 2009 so caregivers of severely injured veterans could take care of our heroes at home. The program provides home health training, peer support, and a small financial stipend to caregivers of severely injured veterans. The caregivers also have access to mental health support and enrollment in the VA's Civilian Health and Mental Program, if they are not already eligible.

When the Caregivers Program was created, we had to limit eligibility for the program to post-9/11 veterans. It has been wildly successful. Twenty thousand veterans who served in Iraq and Afghanistan participate in the program today. This is more than five times the number the VA originally estimated would sign up. The program helps caregivers, who shoulder the cost of homecare, know they are not alone.

Since introducing the Caregivers Program 6 years ago, I have gotten to know many caregivers in my State. One family who lives in Chicago, Dan and Trish Sylvester, made a lasting impression on me. Trish, a veteran of the Iraq war, is 100 percent disabled due to severe PTSD. It can be triggered by anything from a backfiring car to simply a bad thought running through her head. Dan, who is a veteran himself, graduated from DePaul Law School last year and now practices law part time.

Today, as he did all through law school, Dan takes care of Trish, making sure she stays on top of all her medications and going with her to counseling appointments. Trish's symptoms first took hold in February 2011, and she was hospitalized multiple times.

The Sylvesters' found out about the Family Caregiver Program shortly after it was launched and applied with the help of a Jesse Brown VA employee named Erica. They use the Caregivers stipend to pay for counseling services that are not provided by the VA. The money also helped them avoid having to take out more in student loans than they had to and kept Dan from having to add a part-time job to his already full plate when he was a student. Dan says the resources available to him through the program are lifesavers.

Both Trish and Dan showed courage in serving our country. Their sacrifice didn't end after their deployments. They continue to show great courage every day that they work together on Trish's recovery.

The bill Senator BALDWIN and I are introducing today would allow eligible veterans from all wars to apply for the VA Family Caregivers Program. The VA has estimated that as many as 88,000 additional veteran caregivers could qualify for the program under this bill.

Not only does the program allow veterans to stay in their homes with their families, it is a money-saver for taxpayers. The VA spends an average of \$332,000 per veteran per year in VA nursing homes. It spends an average of \$88,000 per veteran per year in community nursing homes. It also spends about \$45,000 a year in per diem payments to veterans in State Veterans Homes. Through the Caregivers Program, the VA cost per veteran per year is about \$36,000. This includes the stipend, which averages between \$600 and \$2,250 a month, based on the level of care and the geographic location, and services provided to the caregiver. It is an enormous savings to the VA, when you consider the cost of the alternative, full-time, institutional care. And it's a tremendous comfort to the veterans and the caregivers who look after them.

I commend each of the caregivers who have made the decision to care for our heroes. These veterans sacrificed their health and well-being for their country, and their caregivers have sacrificed much of their own lives, careers, school, retirement, to care for them upon their return home. We owe each and every one of them a great debt of gratitude. We want to make sure all qualified family caregivers are enrolled in this program.

With this bill, we are on the way to helping many families in need. We can finally provide assistance to the caregivers of Veterans of all eras on an equal basis.

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. 657

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Caregivers Expansion and Improvement Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION TO ALL VETERANS WITH A SERIOUS SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION IN FAMILY CAREGIVER PROGRAM.

Section 1720G(a)(2)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "on or after September 11, 2001".

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a credit for married couples who are both employed and have young children; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to join my colleagues in taking a step back from the partisan bills on the floor this week to talk about the ways we should be able to work together to grow the

economy and help our working families.

Democrats have an economic theory that we are pretty confident about. We believe that real, long-term economic growth is built from the middle out, not from the top down. We believe that government does have a role to play in investing in our working families and making sure they have the opportunity to work hard and succeed, offering a hand up to those who want to climb the economic ladder and provide a better life for themselves and their families. We believe our government and our economy should be working for all families, not just the wealthiest few.

Thankfully we have had the opportunity to put some policies in place over the past few years that have pulled our economy back from the brink and have started moving it in the right direction. We are not there yet, but across the country businesses have added almost 12 million new jobs. We have had over 59 straight months of job growth, including almost 1 million manufacturing jobs. The unemployment rate is now under 6 percent. Health care costs are growing at their lowest rate in almost 50 years, while millions more families now have access to affordable coverage. The Federal budget deficit has been reduced by over two-thirds since President Obama took office.

Although many Republicans seem to keep threatening to bring us back, we have been able to move away from the constant tea party-driven crises and uncertainty that were really destroying jobs and holding back our economy.

We are headed in a good direction. I am proud of the policies that we fought for that helped us to get here, but we do have a whole lot more to do.

The economy has changed over the past few decades, and our Tax Code has not kept up. Working families have seen their incomes stagnate while the cost of living, health care, and education has continued to go up. More and more families have two workers in the workforce, which is a good thing for so many women but brings additional expenses, such as childcare and transportation and the increased marginal tax rate paid by the second worker in the family. That is why I am very proud to introduce two middle-class tax cut bills today that will put money in the pockets of working families and update our Tax Code for the 21st-century economy.

My 21st Century Worker Tax Cut Act would create a new 10-percent credit on up to \$10,000 of the income of the second earner in a family. In other words, qualifying working families can reduce their income taxes by up to \$1,000, which can go a long way toward offsetting some of the additional costs these families bear as they go back to work. That tax cut rewards families for more work, and it would especially help women who want to rejoin the workforce today.

The second bill I am introducing today is the Helping Working Families

Afford Child Care Act. This bill will update and reform the outdated child independent tax credit to help more working families. It would increase the tax credit to keep up with the rising costs of quality childcare and would make sure that the credit actually keeps up with the times by indexing it to inflation.

I am very proud to introduce these two bills today, but I am even more proud that my bills are just two of the bills Democrats are introducing today that will help working families by putting more money in their pockets and helping them access more opportunity. My colleagues are going to be talking about the bills they wrote, but our package of bills also includes, besides what I just talked about, an earned-income and childcare tax credit expansion and expansion of the American opportunity tax credit to help middle-class families afford childcare so they can get back on the job and help them pay for college so they can work hard and invest in themselves and their careers.

We know Republicans like to talk about cutting taxes. Well, with these bills we are giving everyone a chance to do exactly that—and not with more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. Republicans have given that trickle-down theory a try, and it failed. Our approach is tax cuts for the middle class, for the workers who need it the most, to help them afford the costs they are faced with, such as childcare, putting food on the table, getting back on the job, and to give them the opportunity to work hard and succeed.

We want to grow the economy from the middle out, not the top down, and we think these middle-class tax cut bills are a very strong step in the right direction. We hope Republicans will join us to get these done.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 665. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015.

Every day, more than 900,000 Federal, State and local law enforcement offi-

cers put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe. Unfortunately these officers can become targets for criminals and those seeking to evade our justice system, and we must make sure our officers have all the tools they need to protect themselves and each other.

Each year thousands of law enforcement officers are assaulted while performing their duties and many suffer serious injuries or even lose their lives. In December 2014, New York City Police Department officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu were assassinated while sitting in their marked police patrol car in Brooklyn. This legislation is named after those officers in honor of the ultimate sacrifice that they made to serve and protect their fellow citizens.

According to preliminary data compiled by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, law enforcement fatalities in the U.S. rose 24 percent in 2014, reversing what had been two years of dramatic declines in line of duty deaths. The report indicates that 126 federal, state, local, tribal and territorial officers were killed in the line of duty this year, compared to 102 in 2013. Ambush-style attacks such as those that took the lives of officers Ramos and Liu were the number one cause of felonious officer deaths for the fifth year in a row. Fifteen officers nationwide were killed in ambush assaults in 2014, matching 2012 for the highest total since 1995.

I thank my original cosponsors who have joined me in introducing this legislation, including my lead co-sponsor Senator GRAHAM.

The rapid dissemination of critical, time-sensitive information about suspected criminals is essential to keeping our communities safe. This legislation would encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert programs through the United States. The Attorney General would establish a national Blue Alert communications network within the Department of Justice. The Blue Alert system could be used when a law enforcement officer is: seriously injured or killed in the line of duty; missing in connection with the officer's official duties; or an imminent or credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received.

The Blue Alert system could be used when the suspect has not been apprehended, and where there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect and any vehicles involved, if applicable. This information can be used by local law enforcement, the public and the media to help facilitate capture of such offenders and ultimately reduce the risk they pose to our communities and law enforcement officers.

Currently there is no national alert system that provides immediate information to other law enforcement agencies, the media or the public at large. Many states have created a state Blue Alert system in an effort to better in-

form their local communities. The State of Maryland, under the leadership of former Governor Martin O'Malley, created their Blue Alert system in 2008 after the murder of Maryland State Trooper Wesley Brown. Blue Alert programs have been created in 20 states to date, with a growing number of states considering establishing Blue Alert programs.

The purpose of our National Blue Alert legislation is to keep our law enforcement officers and our communities safe. And based on the success of the AMBER Alert and the SILVER Alert, I believe this BLUE Alert will be equally successful in helping to apprehend criminal suspects who have seriously injured or killed our law enforcement officers.

I am also pleased to say this legislation has the endorsement of the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the New York City Police Department, and many other law enforcement associations. Passing this legislation can help us live up to our commitment to help better protect those who serve us. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 96—CONDEMNING THE MURDER OF BORIS NEMTSOV, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 96

Whereas, on February 27, 2015, Russian opposition leader and former deputy prime minister Boris Nemtsov was brutally murdered in the shadow of the Kremlin in Russia's capitol city Moscow;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov was a man of conviction and principle who dedicated his life to the fight against corruption in Russia and sought to advance democracy, human rights, free speech, free market reforms, and the rule of law throughout his life;

Whereas, in December 2011, Mr. Nemtsov helped mobilize the largest anti-Kremlin demonstrations since the early 1990's, leading tens of thousands of Russians to march in protest of widespread fraud and corruption in the parliamentary elections;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation responded by passing a series of harsh laws that vastly expanded the definition of treason, increased government control over the media, and limited the scope and activities of opposition parties and civil society organizations;

Whereas Russian authorities exploit these laws for their own political ends and use them to intimidate members of the opposition, human rights activists, and others with whom they disagree;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov strongly opposed these and other repressive measures, and expressed concerns that President Vladimir Putin's policies were threatening democracy and rule of law in Russia;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov strongly criticized Russia's annexation of Crimea and military

activities in eastern Ukraine, blaming President Putin for a “mad, aggressive and deadly policy of war against Ukraine” and lying to the Russian people about this policy;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov had been investigating Russia’s role in Ukraine and was preparing to release an investigative report conclusively proving the participation of the Russian Armed Forces in the invasion of Ukraine and revealing the extent to which the Government of the Russian Federation was involved;

Whereas, prior to his death, Mr. Nemtsov planned to lead a Spring March on March 1, 2015, to protest the Russian military’s presence in Ukraine;

Whereas, on February 28, 2015, Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko stated that he believed Mr. Nemtsov had been murdered because he planned to disclose this evidence of Russia’s involvement in Ukraine;

Whereas President Putin called critics of his government “a fifth column” and “national traitors”, inviting violent attacks upon them and sponsoring a campaign of hatred, intimidation, and aggression;

Whereas, on February 20, 2015, a new movement called Anti-Maidan marched freely through Moscow calling for violence against this “fifth column”, with signs naming Mr. Nemtsov as an enemy of Russia;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov’s colleagues stated that he was under state surveillance shortly before his murder and he was murdered in one of the most heavily-secured areas of Moscow, suggesting the Government of Russia’s culpability;

Whereas other prominent figures in Russia who have criticized President Putin and his government have also been assassinated, including Vladimir Goloviyov, Yuri Shchekochikhin, Anna Politkovskaya, Alexander Litvinenko, Magomed Yevloyev, Stanslav Markelov, and Natalia Estermirova;

Whereas none of the individuals responsible for these assassinations have been brought to justice, raising serious questions about the ability of Russian authorities to conduct a credible investigation into Mr. Nemtsov’s murder;

Whereas a culture of impunity and lack of accountability prevail in Putin’s Russia, with law enforcement, judicial, and investigative bodies often used to target political opponents and civil society, and thus lacking credibility to conduct an investigation themselves;

Whereas the Russia Investigative Committee released a list of motives for Mr. Nemtsov’s murder which do not take into account his role as a prominent government critic, surveillance cameras were allegedly turned off for maintenance during the time of his murder, and Kremlin-sponsored channels are inciting fear and hatred by propagating conspiracy theories that blame the United States for his assassination;

Whereas these continuing assassinations are intended to intimidate the people of Russia and undermine political and social reform in the Russian Federation; and

Whereas support for rule of law and human rights in the Russian Federation will help ensure its future as a free, strong, and vibrant society and enduring stability in the Russian Federation will come from an active civil society in which democracy flourishes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the courageous work of Boris Nemtsov, a tireless advocate for reform and human rights who sacrificed his life in the fight for freedom and democracy in the Russian Federation;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the family, friends, and colleagues of Mr.

Nemtsov, as well as to all the people of Russia;

(3) condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the murder of Boris Nemtsov on February 27, 2015, as well as the assassinations of numerous other human rights and democracy activists in the Russian Federation since President Vladimir Putin came to office;

(4) urges the President to seek a United Nations Security Council resolution that establishes an independent investigation into the assassination;

(5) calls upon the Government of Russia to support and facilitate an independent inquiry into the murder of Mr. Nemtsov;

(6) urges the Government of the Russian Federation to release all political prisoners and to end the ongoing harassment of political opponents, human rights activists, and journalists;

(7) calls for the restoration of an independent judiciary and the rule of law in the Russian Federation, and an end to all restrictions on the media and freedom of speech;

(8) urges the President to add the names of persons that Mr. Nemtsov requested be added to the visa ban list as provided for under the Sergei Manitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law 112-208) and continue to sanction human rights violators in the Russian Federation;

(9) urges the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to obtain, examine, and publish the investigative report Mr. Nemtsov planned to release as part of the OSCE observer role in eastern Ukraine to demonstrate the inability of the Government of the Russian Federation to suppress the truth Mr. Nemtsov represented; and

(10) urges the President to significantly increase United States Government support to like-minded partners and human rights activists in the Russian Federation to create a more vibrant civil society and open media environment in which democracy can flourish.

SENATE RESOLUTION 97—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN’S DAY

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KIRK, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 97

Whereas there are more than 3,500,000,000 women in the world today;

Whereas women around the world have fundamental human rights, participate in the political, social, and economic life of their communities, play a critical role in providing and caring for their families, contribute substantially to the growth of economies and the prevention of conflict, and, as farmers and caregivers, play an important role in advancing food security for their communities;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas on September 24, 2014, President Barack Obama highlighted the United States support for the advancement of women, noting: “Where women are full participants in a country’s politics or economy, societies are more likely to succeed. And that’s why we support the participation of women in parliaments and peace processes, schools, and the economy.”;

Whereas women remain underrepresented in conflict prevention and conflict resolution efforts, despite proven success by women in conflict-affected regions in moderating violent extremism, countering terrorism, resolving disputes through nonviolent mediation and negotiation, and stabilizing societies by improving access to peace and security services, institutions, and decision-making venues;

Whereas on December 19, 2011, the Obama Administration launched the first United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (referred to in this preamble as the “National Action Plan”) that includes a comprehensive set of national commitments to advance the active participation of women in decisionmaking relating to matters of war and peace;

Whereas the National Action Plan states the following: “Deadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be best forged and sustained, when women become equal partners in all aspects of peace-building and conflict prevention, when their lives are protected, their experiences considered, and their voices heard.”;

Whereas the National Action Plan requires the National Security Council staff to coordinate a comprehensive review of, and update to, the National Action Plan in 2015 with consultation from international partners and civil society organizations;

Whereas according to the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State, women’s full and meaningful participation in security forces vastly enhances their effectiveness;

Whereas the ability of women and girls to realize their full potential is critical to the ability of a country to achieve strong and lasting economic growth and political and social stability;

Whereas according to the International Monetary Fund, “focusing on the needs and empowerment of women is one of the keys to human development”;

Whereas according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, two-thirds of the 781,000,000 illiterate people in the world are female;

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development, compared to uneducated women, “educated women are less likely to marry early and more likely to have smaller and healthier families. They are also more likely to get a job and earn a higher wage.”;

Whereas according to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the majority of women living in rural areas of the developing world are heavily engaged in agricultural labor, yet they receive less credit, land, agricultural inputs, and training than their male counterparts;

Whereas according to the United Nations Population Fund, women have access to fewer income-earning opportunities and are more likely to manage the household and engage in agricultural work, making women more vulnerable to economic insecurity caused by natural disasters and long-term changes in weather patterns;

Whereas according to the World Bank, women own or partly own more than one-third of small and medium-sized enterprises in developing countries, and 40 percent of the global workforce is female, yet, women entrepreneurs and employers have disproportionately less access to capital and other financial services compared to men;

Whereas despite strides in recent decades, women around the world continue to face significant obstacles in all aspects of their lives, including underrepresentation in all aspects of public life, denial of basic human rights, and discrimination;

Whereas despite achievements by individual female leaders, women around the world are still vastly underrepresented in high-level positions and in national and local legislatures and governments and, according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women account for only 21.9 percent of national parliamentarians;

Whereas 1 in 3 women around the world has experienced some form of gender-based violence, and 1 in 4 women has suffered abuse during pregnancy;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, approximately 800 women die from preventable causes related to pregnancy and childbirth every day, with 99 percent of all maternal deaths occurring in developing countries;

Whereas according to the United Nations Population Fund, more than 200,000,000 women and girls around the world would like to access family planning services but are unable to do so;

Whereas according to data from the World Bank, women between the ages of 15 and 44 are at a greater risk of rape and domestic violence than cancer, war, traffic accidents, and malaria combined;

Whereas on August 10, 2012, President Barack Obama announced the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, the first inter-agency strategy to address gender-based violence around the world;

Whereas violence against women and girls impedes progress in meeting many international global development goals, including efforts to stem maternal mortality and the spread of HIV/AIDS;

Whereas on October 11, 2013, President Barack Obama stated that the practice of child marriage was a “threat to fundamental human rights”;

Whereas according to the International Center for Research on Women, one-third of girls worldwide are married before the age of 18 and 1 in 9 girls are married before the age of 15;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, suicide is the leading cause of death for girls ages 15 to 19, followed by complications from pregnancy and childbirth;

Whereas it is imperative to alleviate violence and discrimination against women and afford women every opportunity to be full and productive members of their communities;

Whereas 2015 marks the 20th anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women, where 189 countries committed to the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action to integrate gender equality into all dimensions of society;

Whereas 2015 marks the deadline for meeting the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, and progress towards meeting the targets for gender equality and women’s empowerment remains uneven; and

Whereas March 8 is recognized each year as International Women’s Day, a global day to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women past, present, and future, and to recognize the obstacles that women still face in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of International Women’s Day;

(2) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of countries to generate economic growth, sustainable democracy, and inclusive security;

(3) recognizes and honors individuals in the United States and around the world, including women who are human rights defenders, who have worked throughout history to en-

sure that women are guaranteed equality and basic human rights;

(4) reaffirms the commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women and girls worldwide, and to promoting meaningful and significant participation of women in all aspects of their societies and communities;

(5) supports international calls for a “Post-2015 Development Agenda” to include a stand-alone goal to achieve gender equality and women’s empowerment; and

(6) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women’s Day with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 98—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 98

Whereas multiple sclerosis (referred to in this preamble as “MS”) can impact people of all ages, races, and ethnicities, but is at least 2 to 3 times more common in women than in men;

Whereas there are approximately 2,300,000 people worldwide who have been diagnosed with MS;

Whereas MS is typically diagnosed in individuals between the ages of 20 and 50, however it is estimated that between 8,000 and 10,000 children and adolescents are living with MS in the United States;

Whereas MS is an unpredictable neurological disease that interrupts the flow of information both within the brain and between the brain and the rest of the body;

Whereas symptoms of MS range from numbness and tingling in the extremities to blindness and paralysis, and the progress, severity, and specific symptoms of MS in any one person cannot yet be predicted;

Whereas there is no laboratory test available that can definitively diagnose MS;

Whereas while MS is not directly inherited, studies show that there are genetic and, probably, environmental factors that make certain individuals, such as Caucasians of Northern European ancestry, more susceptible to the disease than others;

Whereas the exact cause of MS is still unknown and there is no cure;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition, a national network of independent MS organizations dedicated to the enhancement of the quality of life for all those affected by MS, recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

Whereas the mission of the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition is to increase opportunities for cooperation among MS organizations and provide greater opportunity for the effective use and development of resources for the benefit of individuals and families affected by MS;

Whereas the United States plays a critical role in coordinating MS research globally and amplifies the impact of research in the United States through which results are delivered to MS patients;

Whereas in 2012, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society of the United States was a founding member of the Progressive MS Alliance, which coordinates research to accelerate the development of treatments for pro-

gressive MS by removing international scientific and technological barriers, and which now includes MS societies from 11 countries;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week during March of every calendar year;

Whereas the goals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week are to invite people to join the movement to end MS, encourage everyone to do something to demonstrate their commitment to moving toward a world free of MS, and to acknowledge those who have dedicated their time and talent to help promote MS research and programs; and

Whereas this year, Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week is recognized during the week of March 2, 2015, through March 8, 2015: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(2) encourages States, localities, and the territories and possessions of the United States to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week by issuing proclamations designating Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(3) encourages media organizations to participate in Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week and help provide education to the public about multiple sclerosis;

(4) commends the efforts of States, localities, and the territories and possessions of the United States to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(5) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to ending multiple sclerosis by—

(A) promoting awareness about individuals that are affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) supporting multiple sclerosis research and education programs;

(6) recognizes all individuals in the United States living with multiple sclerosis;

(7) expresses gratitude to the family members and friends of individuals living with multiple sclerosis, who are a source of love and encouragement to those individuals; and

(8) salutes the health care professionals and medical researchers who—

(A) provide assistance to individuals affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) continue to work to find ways to stop the progression of the disease, restore nerve function, and end multiple sclerosis forever.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE SHOULD ISSUE A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE THREE CIVIL RIGHTS MARCHES FROM SELMA, ALABAMA TO MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA THAT TOOK PLACE OVER THE COURSE OF SEVERAL WEEKS IN MARCH 1965

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 8

Whereas on March 7, 1965 “Bloody Sunday”, approximately 600 civil rights marchers, led by now-Representative John Lewis of

the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Reverend Hosea Williams of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, headed east out of Selma, Alabama to the State Capitol in Montgomery, Alabama;

Whereas the civil rights activists sought to protest discriminatory voter registration practices, and the shooting of Jimmie Lee Jackson, who was shot after protecting his mother and grandfather in a civil rights demonstration on February 18, 1965, in a restaurant in Marion, Alabama, and died eight days later on February 26, 1965;

Whereas the nonviolent marchers were met and attacked with clubs, whips, police dogs, and tear gas carried by State troopers, local lawmen, and townspeople at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they were leaving Selma;

Whereas dozens of peaceful marchers were injured in the forced retreat by State troopers, local lawmen, and townspeople;

Whereas images of innocent protestors brutally beaten and severely injured on March 7, 1965, remembered as "Bloody Sunday", were depicted in television screens and in newspaper articles across the country;

Whereas Bloody Sunday galvanized a generation of civil rights activists, and heightened support and awareness for the civil rights movement;

Whereas on March 9, 1965, two days later, Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. led a non-violent protest reportedly as many as 2,500 people before turning around after crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge due to a barricade of State troopers;

Whereas on March 15, 1965, despite pressure from political figures, U.S. District Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr., issued an injunction allowing the voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery to proceed, overturning then-Alabama Governor George Wallace's prohibition of the protest;

Whereas on March 21, 1965, with the protection of U.S. Army troops and the Alabama National Guard, more than 3,000 people, led by Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., set out from Selma to Montgomery, a 54-mile journey, marching an average of twelve miles a day along Route 80 and sleeping in fields;

Whereas the nonviolent protestors safely reached the steps of the Alabama State Capitol on March 25, 1965, by which point their numbers had grown to 25,000, including many religious and community leaders of all denominations, races, and backgrounds;

Whereas during these pivotal weeks, on March 17, 1965, and with the Selma protestors at the forefront, President Lyndon Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress, calling for Federal voting rights legislation to protect African Americans from barriers that prevented them from voting;

Whereas with the Nation captivated by the courage and conviction displayed by the civil rights activists, the United States Congress passed and President Lyndon B. Johnson enacted into law the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965 on August 6, 1965; and

Whereas issuing a postage stamp honoring the fiftieth anniversary of the civil rights marches is fitting and proper because the marches united our country and helped affirm the principle that all Americans shall be treated equally at the voting booths as guaranteed under the United States Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Postmaster General should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the 50th anniversary of the three civil rights marches from Selma, Alabama, to Montgomery, Alabama; and

(2) such stamp should—

(A) be issued in the denomination used for first-class mail up to 1 ounce in weight;

(B) bear such illustration or picture as the Postmaster General determines; and

(C) be placed in sale at such time and for such period as the Postmaster General determines.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9—HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF REVEREND THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C., PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Mr. REID of Nevada (for Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. COATS)) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 9

Whereas Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., was born on May 25, 1917, in Syracuse, New York, ordained a priest of the Congregation of Holy Cross on June 24, 1943, in South Bend, Indiana, and served as president of the University of Notre Dame from 1952 to 1987;

Whereas during his tenure, the University of Notre Dame welcomed female students for the first time and embraced the spirit of open intellectual inquiry and moral engagement that defines the University today;

Whereas Father Hesburgh held a variety of appointed positions under 4 popes and 9 presidential administrations;

Whereas throughout decades of public service, Father Hesburgh proudly championed the civil rights of African Americans, the duty of society to the poor, and the fundamental human dignity of all persons;

Whereas in pursuit of those ideals, Father Hesburgh held a variety of influential public roles, including terms as a founding member and chairman of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, chair of the Overseas Development Council, chair of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, and permanent representative of the Holy See to the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna from 1956 to 1970;

Whereas in pursuit of global social justice, Father Hesburgh reaffirmed the commitment of the University of Notre Dame to human rights by helping to found the Kellogg Institute for International Studies and the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University as well as the Center for Civil and Human Rights at the University of Notre Dame Law School;

Whereas Father Hesburgh was a longtime advocate for the responsible stewardship of atomic energy and gracefully brought together scientists, scholars, and spiritual leaders to work toward an end to nuclear conflict;

Whereas Father Hesburgh served as ambassador to the 1979 United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development, the first Catholic priest to formally hold a diplomatic position for the United States Government;

Whereas Father Hesburgh received both the Congressional Gold Medal and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian awards of the United States, as well as more than 150 honorary degrees, the most ever awarded to a single individual; and

Whereas Father Hesburgh passed away on Thursday, February 26, 2015, but remains very much alive in the hearts of all who knew him and in the University that he loved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress—

(1) commemorates the life and achievements of Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh,

C.S.C., who throughout his life displayed extraordinary commitment to social justice and the improvement of higher education; and

(2) honors Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., for a lifetime of selfless dedication to God, Country, and Notre Dame.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, a subcommittee hearing entitled "Surface Transportation Reauthorization-Oversight and Reform of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration."

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight Hearing: The President's FY 2016 Budget Request for the Environmental Protection Agency."

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2015, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2015, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Whistleblower Retaliation at the FBI: Improving Protections and Oversight."

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of

the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE AND REGIONAL SECURITY COOPERATION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Russian Aggression in Eastern Europe: Where does Putin Go Next after Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova?"

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 3:30 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Jessica Clarke of my staff for the duration of today.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern Jackman Wilson be allowed privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that Cale Clingenpeel, an intern on my staff, be granted privileges of the floor for the duration of the day.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 9, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 15, Calendar No. 22, Calendar No. 49, and Calendar No. 50; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote

without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that following the disposition of the Tonsager nomination, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 98, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 98) supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further 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. 98) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 6 AND MONDAY, MARCH 9, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Friday, March 6, for a pro forma session with no business being conducted; further, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, March 6, it next convene at 2 p.m., Monday, March 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m. and that Senators be permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided in the usual form; finally, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators should expect a rollcall vote on the Marti nomination at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, with the other nominations in the stack going by voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 2015, AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:02 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 6, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN CONGER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE MICHAEL J. MCCORD, RESIGNED.

PETER LEVINE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE ELIZABETH A. MCGRATH.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GREGORY T. DELAWIE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO.

PERRY L. HOLLOWAY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CO-OPERATIVE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

SUNIL SABHARWAL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS, VICE DOUGLAS A. REDIKER, RESIGNED.

MARK SOBEL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS, VICE MARGRETHE LUNDSAGER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ERICKA M. MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE EDUARDO M. OCHOA.

MICHAEL KEITH YUDIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE ALEXA E. POSNY.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BURKE W. WHITMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL F. FAHEY III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CRAIG C. CRENSHAW
BRIG. GEN. JOHN K. LOVE
BRIG. GEN. NIEL E. NELSON
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN R. RUDDER
BRIG. GEN. CRAIG Q. TIMBERLAKE

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER M. ABBOTT

CHRISTIAN M. ABODEELY
 ANDREW MICHAEL ACKLES
 CHRISTOPHER A. ADAMS
 JOSEPH M. ADAMS
 ISAAC E. ADCOCK
 JIMMY T. ADDISON
 JESSICA L. ADKINS
 JONATHAN A. AEVERMANN
 ANIBAL AGUIRRE, JR.
 CLINTON R. ALBAUGH
 JUSTIN S. ALBERICO
 JARED K. ALDEN
 EARL J. ALEXANDER II
 TOMAS D. ALFORD
 DANIEL C. ALIX
 BRADLEY R. ALLEN
 BRIAN G. ALLEN
 DARCY M. ALLEN
 JEREMY L. ALLEN
 JOSHUA J. ALLEN
 NATHAN J. ALLEN
 RYAN DALE ALLEN
 TERRANCE S. ALLEN
 ADAM ALM
 GABRIEL ALMODOVAR
 ACHILLE HENRY PAUL ALOISI
 DAVID ALEXANDER ALPAR
 JOHN G. ALSBROOKS
 PETER J. AMARAL
 RUI F. AMARAL
 PHILIP ALAN AMIRAULT
 JESSICA L. AMUNDSON
 BRIAN A. AN
 JAYSON D. ANDERSEN
 CHRISTIAN T. ANDERSON
 JACOB ANDERSON
 JESSE ANDERSON
 KEVIN S. ANDERSON
 PAUL F. ANDERSON
 RYAN B. ANDERSON
 SCOTT L. ANDERSON
 WESLEY S. ANDERSON
 JAMES MAYBERRY ANDREWS, JR.
 JAMIE LEE ANDREWS
 MATTHEW ANDREWS
 JEREMY ANKRUM
 JAMES R. ANTFONE
 ROBERT A. ARENA
 COLBY K. ARENDS
 JOSHUA M. ARENS
 KARYN ARGUETA
 MICHAEL R. ARMBRUSTER, JR.
 MARK B. ARMSTRONG
 SEAN M. ARMSTRONG
 THOMAS F. ARMSTRONG
 CHRISTOPHER L. ARNOTT
 EMILY M. ARTHUR
 AARON L. ARTING
 RAPHAEL C. ASHE
 JEFFREY M. AUBRY
 MARC C. AURILIO
 MARC C. AUSTIN
 ISHAN B. VILA
 NOAH F. AYERS
 MATTHEW T. BABER
 STACY M. BABER
 RANDY BACKLEY
 VERONICA E. BAEZ
 CHRISTOPHER F. BAILEY
 MICHAEL W. BAIN
 CINDY BAKER
 CRAIG P. BAKER
 DAWN A. BAKER
 JONATHAN L. BAKER
 KATHLEEN M. BAKER
 MICHAEL C. BAKER
 PAUL J. BAKER
 ALFREDO BALDERAS
 BRIAN BATES
 JUSTIN P. BALLINGER
 CHRISTIAN Y. BALMACEDA
 CHRISTOPHER BALSTERS
 REBECCA W. BAN
 ADAM B. BANDUCCI
 AARON N. BANDY
 TIMOTHY R. BANKS, JR.
 MAGINA BAONGA
 ERIC W. BARADA
 LAILA S. BARASHA
 BRANDON ARTHUR BARD
 TIFFANY L. BARBS
 DANIEL BARKER
 RICHARD T. BARKER
 JESSE N. BARNES
 JOHN M. BARRETT
 JUSTIN R. BARRETT
 GREGORY CHARLES BARRY
 IAN ROBERT BARTA
 DANIEL J. BARTLEY
 RYAN L. BARTON
 DENNIS R. BATAO
 YURI A. BATTEN
 KATHERINE A. BATTERTON
 NICHOLAS J. BATTLE
 AARON C. BAUM
 FRANK ANDREW BAUMANN IV
 LEIGH A. BAUMBAUGH
 JARNO BAUR MATTHEWS
 NICHOLAS J. BEAMER
 SEAN R. BEASLEY
 DERRYL L. BEAUDOIN
 MATHEW J. BECK
 BRADLEY D. BECKWITH
 JARROD N. BEERS
 CHRISTOPHER A. BEHRENS
 BRYAN M. BELL
 NATHANIEL J. BELL

CARLOS M. BENITEZ
 MICHAEL WILLIAM BENITEZ
 DEREK R. BENKOSKI
 BENJAMIN MONT BENNETT
 CHRISTOPHER M. BENNETT
 DAVID JAMES BENNETT
 DAVID W. BENNETT
 BRYCE J. BENSON
 BROOK I. BENTLEY
 DONALD J. BENZING III
 CHRISTOPHER W. BERARDI
 EDWARD G. BERGELAND
 JEREMY BERGMANN
 ANTHONY JOSEPH BERNARDI
 BRANDON J. BERNARDONI
 JAMES R. BERNINGHAUSEN
 CLEMENTE A. BERRIOS
 BRIAN T. BERRY
 CARLOS R. BERSABE
 BRANDON D. BERT
 IAN S. BERTRAM
 JEREMIAH NATHANAEAL BETZ
 JOSHUA D. BIBB
 JON A. BILLMAN
 ANTOINE L. BILLS
 DANIEL B. BIRGE
 MATTHEW WILLIAM BIRKENHIER
 BOBBY D. BIRRRER
 JARED L. BISHOP
 JESSICA L. BISHOP
 JESSE G. BJURBACK
 BRANDON M. BLACK
 TRAVIS A. BLACK
 JEFFERY MICHAEL BLACKRICK
 CHRISTOPHER A. BLAKE
 RYAN C. BLAKE
 JONATHAN DAVID BLANCO
 NICOLE J. BLECHA
 TAYLOR A. BLEVINS
 ADAM J. BLOCK
 BEAU A. BLOWE
 DANIEL G. BLOOM
 RICHARD M. BLOOM
 SARAH E. BLOUGH
 ARMIN A. BLUEGEL
 BRENDA E. BLUEGEL
 TODD L. BLUM
 THOMAS D. BOCRKAETH
 ROLAND BODENHEIM
 KATHARINE T. BOEING
 BRIAN T. BOHAN
 DANIEL H. BOLIN
 SAMANTHA C. BOLIN
 CHRISTINE L. BOLTON
 VINCENT I. BONGIOANNI
 SCOTT A. BOOTH
 WILLIAM F. BOOTH II
 NICOLLETTE BORGSTROM
 PAUL BORIACK
 NICHOLAS S. BOSIAK
 JESSICA LEE BOSS
 JOSHUA A. BOUCHER
 ROBERT F. BOUFFARD
 JASON R. BOURGOIN
 JONATHAN BOWIE
 ZACHARY L. BOWEN
 SARAH E. BOWLES
 PAMELA A. BOYARSKI
 ADAM B. BOYD
 WILLIAM M. BOYLES
 DOUGLAS A. BOYTIM
 DIANA K. BRADFELD
 BLAKE S. BRADFORD
 ROBERT T. BRADLEY
 DAVID J. BRAITHWAITE
 MARY E. BRAUN
 MATTHEW G. BRAUND
 DAVID T. BREDESEN
 TIMOTHY W. BREITBACH
 KYLE J. BREMHOLM
 NICHOLAS W. BRENCE
 ERICK D. BRENDSEL
 EDWARD N. BRENNAN
 JUSTINE J. BRENT
 ADAM R. BRESHOCK
 GARRETT R. BRIDGES
 MATTHEW D. BRILL
 ERIN BRILLA
 NICHOLAS J. BRINEY
 SERENA V. BRIONES
 STEVE C. BRIONES
 BRADFORD J. BRIZEK
 JOSHUA C. BROCK
 JUSTIN M. BROCKHOFF
 KEVIN M. BROCKLER
 ZACHARY F. BRODEUR
 ADAM L. BROOKS
 CHRISTOPHER S. BROOKS
 STEVEN B. BROOKS
 AUSTIN C. BROWN
 GABRIEL P. BROWN
 IVAN D. BROWN
 JASON T. BROWN
 JONAH R. BROWN
 STANTON P. BROWN
 NICHOLAS S. BROWNHEIM
 MARK S. BROWNING
 CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH BRUMFIELD
 PETER J. BRUNKE
 TRAVIS R. BRYCE
 MARSHALL BUCK
 RICHARD A. BUCKLEY
 ROBERT H. BUCKLEY
 ERIC M. BUDD
 JEFFREY L. BUDIS
 EMILY P. BULGER
 CHRISTOPHER BULLA

KEVIN A. BULLEY
 CONINGSBY J. BURDON
 JOSHUA A. BURGER
 ERIC L. BURKE
 JEFFREY A. BURKE
 IDA LEE BURKEY
 DUSTIN K. BURLESON
 MARK R. BURLEY
 BRANDON E. BURNS
 TRAVIS J. BURNS
 JOSEPH L. BURNSIED
 JARED M. BURRIS
 WILLIAM B. BURROUS
 RYAN LEWIS BUSBEY
 BRIAN C. BUSCH
 WILLIAM L. BUSCH
 ERIC A. BUSCHELMAN
 CHRISTOPHER BUSH
 ADAM M. BUSHORE
 BENJAMIN JOHN BUSLER
 MICHAEL J. BUSSE
 ANTHONY L. BUTLER
 BRYAN E. BUTLER
 MICHAEL J. BUTLER
 MICHAEL J. BUTLER
 TREVOR A. BUTLER
 BENJAMIN B. BUXTON
 JEREMY BUXTON
 JONATHAN M. BYARD
 DEREK CADA
 BRANDY M. CAFFEE
 ERIC THOMAS L. CAGURANGAN
 DOMINIC S. CALDERON
 CLIFFORD A. CALDWELL
 AARON P. CALHOON
 JESSE D. CALLAND
 CHRISTOPHER D. CALLAWAY
 PAUL E. CAMERON IV
 VINCENT R. CAMMARANO
 TODD A. CAMPBELL
 DAVID P. CANCEL
 GEORGE E. CANNON III
 ANTHONY J. CANNONE
 JASON T. CARANTA
 MARIA E. CARDONA
 JOHN F. CAREW, JR.
 SCOTT MICHAEL CARLIN
 BENJAMIN CARLSON
 JEREMIAH B. CARLSON
 MICHAEL M. CARLSON
 SEAN CARLSON
 JOSHUA C. CARMER
 DENNIS JOHN CARMODY
 RYAN W. CARR
 JAMES M. CARRABIA
 RAPHAEL N. CARRANZA
 BRENT M. CARROLL
 DANIEL R. CARROLL
 KEITH CARSON
 JOHN B. CARTER
 JOSHUA CARTER
 JOSHUA A. CARTER
 MATHEW K. CARTER
 JOHN W. CARTY II
 JARED D. CASEBOLT
 BRYAN J. CASEY
 PATRICK CASEY
 ELIZABETH C. CASKEY
 CAROLINE D. CASSIDY
 ALBERTO CASTANEDA
 MATT C. CASTANEDA
 YURIZA J. CASTILLOAGUIRRE
 BRETT C. CASTLE
 STEPHEN M. CASTLEN
 NEAL CATRON
 AARON B. CAVAZOS
 AARON W. CELAYA
 NICHOLAS A. CENCI
 LISIA M. CERPERO
 ERIC J. CERCONI
 MICHAEL B. CESAR
 MATHEW R. CHAMBERLAIN
 ALBERT J. CHANG
 JENNIFER H. CHANG
 NATHAN K. CHANG
 PHILIP A. CHAPMAN
 JOHN E. CHAPPELLE, JR.
 ERIC J. CHAREST
 CHRISTOPHER A. CHARRON
 JESSA A. CHARRON
 JOHN M. CHEEK
 WYATT C. CHEEK
 KUAN HSUN CHEN
 PEISHUE CHEN
 SAMUEL C. CHIPMAN
 DEVIN J. CHIRINSKY
 DANIEL J. CHISOLM
 NICOLE T. CHMIELEWSKI
 DAE BOK CHO
 JAMES CHO
 JAMES A. CHONGRIS
 JOSHUA C. CHRISTOPHER
 MATTHEW C. CICHOWSKI
 CORY A. CILIA
 TYLER L. CISNEROS
 CODY W. CLARK
 DANIEL ALLEN CLARK
 NATHAN MICHAEL CLARK
 ROSS E. CLARK
 ZACHARY R. CLARKE
 ERICK J. CLAYSON
 JASON S. CLAYTON
 MATTHEW E. CLAYTON
 ERIC CLEMENTS
 APRIL H. CLEMENSEN
 RANDAL W. CLER
 JUSTIN L. CLEVELAND

ADAM CLIFT
 JON A. CLINGERBREWSTER
 MONICA CLODWICK
 NICHOLAS J. CLOSSMAN
 ELIZABETH U. CO
 ANDREW J. COBB
 NICHOLAS A. COBLIO
 ZACHARY L. COBURN
 NICHOLAS J. COCCIA
 CHRISTOPHER F. COFFMAN
 JEREMY R. COFFMAN
 LEROY A. COHEN
 ADAM C. COLE
 DEREK A. COLE
 PAUL A. COLELLA
 DANIEL R. COLEMAN
 JASON L. COLEMAN
 MICHAEL L. COLEMAN
 TIMOTHY C. COLES
 NATHAN AARON COLESTOCK
 PEDRO J. COLLAZO
 KELLY R. COLLIER
 CHRISTOPHER L. COLLINS
 JESSICA R. COLMAN
 CARLOS M. COLON, JR.
 JARVIS W. COMBS
 CHRISTOPHER M. CONANT
 JACOB CONGER
 JOHN PAUL CONNER
 DANIEL J. CONNORS
 ANDREW C. CONWELL
 BRANDON C. CONYERS
 EBONY S. COOK
 JUSTIN D. COOK
 SARAH L. COOK
 ZACHARY COOK
 DIAMOND D. COOKSON
 DANIEL W. COOMBS
 RONNIE AUGUST COOPER, JR.
 DAVID AMOS CORDER
 CARLOS S. CORDERO
 GABRIEL G. CORRALES
 BRIAN J. COTE
 DANIEL D. COUGHLIN
 ALEXANDER A. COURTNEY III
 MAXWELL COVER
 JUSTIN E. COWLEY
 BRENT A. COX
 CHRISTOPHER R. COX
 JAMES M. COX
 STEPHANIE M. COX
 MATT S. CRABB
 MICLYNN E. CRAIL
 ADAM S. CRANE
 DANIEL S. CRANE
 ANDREW HALDEMAN CRAWFORD
 JAMES K. CRAWFORD
 JOSE L. CRESPO
 KYLE C. CROSBY
 ROBERT M. CROSS
 RYAN T. CROSS
 MATTHEW P. CROSSER
 BRADLEY G. CROSSON
 CHRISTOPHER D. CROUCH
 CAROLYN CRUZ
 LAWRENCE J. CUCULIC
 MATTHEW CULBERTSON
 BRETT J. CULLEN
 CASEY R. CUNNINGHAM
 RYAN H. CUNNINGHAM
 ERNESTO F. CURIEL
 DANIEL TODD CURRIE
 MICHAEL J. CURRY
 ALFRED CURTIS III
 DAVID H. CURTIS
 SEAN H. CURTIS
 CAMERON L. CZARNIECKI
 WHITMAN T. DAILEY
 MATTHEW P. DALE
 RUSSELL DAVID DALHART
 JEFFREY RICHARD DALLAS
 CHRISTOPHER M. DANIELS
 JOSHUA G. DANIELS
 WILLIAM M. DANYLUK
 ADAM C. DARROW
 WHITTICAR S. DARVILL
 CHRISTOPHER L. DAUER
 CONOR RILEY DAUGHERTY
 GARY P. DAUGHERTY II
 JOEL T. DAVEE
 KYLE R. DAVIDSON
 ROBERT DAVIDSON
 BRADLEY W. DAVIES
 ARLEN R. DAVIS
 CHRISTOPHER WALTER DAVIS
 JACOB M. DAVIS
 JOHN DAVIS
 JONATHAN M. DAVIS
 JOSEPH D. DAVIS
 KHARY S. DAVIS
 TYSON G. DAW
 CINDY D. DAWSON
 CHARLES J. DAY
 ANA C. DE FIGUEROA
 EDWARD D. DE IULIO
 JESSICA E. DE IULIO
 BRIAN A. DEA
 BENJAMIN P. DEAN
 MATTHEW M. DEARDORFF
 JACOB H. DEBEVEC
 TIFFANY L. DEBROW
 DUSTIN M. DEDMORE
 SANDRA A. DEFAZIO
 BRIAN JOSEPH DELA CRUZ
 DAVID DELMAGE
 GEORGE H. DELONG
 GLEN A. DEMARS

ALEXANDER HENRY DEMMA
 ALLISON ANNE DEMPSEY
 CHRISTOPHER A. DEMPSEY
 KRISTINA M. DEMPSEY
 DANIEL J. DENNEY
 DAVID R. DENNIS
 RICHARD N. DEROHAN
 MICHAEL A. DEVITA
 GEORGES X. DEWILDE
 MICHAEL R. DI PRISCO
 CARLOS J. DIAZ SERRANO
 VALENTINO A. DIAZ
 BRIAN A. DICKINSON
 DANIEL S. DICKINSON
 MARK W. DICKINSON
 MATTHEW J. DIEHL
 SCOTT D. DIEHL
 DANIEL P. DIEMER
 KEVIN J. DIPALCO
 RONALD J. DION
 MATTHEW A. DISTEFANO
 JARED T. DOCKENDORF
 MICAH N. DODDS
 JOSEPH G. DOLCE
 PAUL F. DOLCE
 MELISSA L. DOMBROCK
 JOSEPH DOMBROW
 TIMOTHY DONAHO
 BRIAN PATRICK DONNELL
 RYAN EMERSON DONOHUE
 LUKE T. DONOVAN
 KRISTA D. DORAN
 ZACHARY T. DORMAN
 RECO MAURICE DOUGHTY
 ANDREW J. DOWD
 JOSEPH RILEY DOWELL
 JOSHUA DOWNING
 JARED MICHAEL DOYLE
 MICHAEL S. DRAGOON
 LOGAN R. DRAVES
 JUDSON C. DRESSLER
 ANNIE K. DRISCOLL
 TAYLOR B. BROKE
 NICOLE DRONEY
 BRIAN E. DUDLEY
 AARON J. DUFF
 CHRISTOPHER F. DUFF
 MARC B. DUPRESNE
 BRIAN A. DUMM
 JARVORA B. DUNCAN
 MARK C. DUNCAN
 SAMUEL C. DUNLAP
 MATTHEW D. DUNN
 MICHAEL ADAM DUNN
 ROBERT F. DUNPHY
 CHRISTOPHER A. DUPUIS
 JEFFREY D. DUPUIS
 JEFFREY DURHAM
 RICHARD D. DURSTEIN
 STEPHEN B. DZIALO
 BRIANNA MAE EADS
 JAMES E. EBERLY
 RYAN T. EDENSTROM
 SUNNI R. EDINGER
 NATHANIEL L. EDWARDS
 JOSEPH EARL EHRNFELD
 MITCHELL ARTHUR EHRESMAN
 JONATHAN P. EIZENBERG
 BRENTON J. EKREN
 MIKE EL MANN
 DARIN S. ELGERSMA
 TAMMIE N. ELLERBE
 DANIELE SUTHERLAND ELLIOTT
 JUSTIN J. ELLIOTT
 BRENT A. ELLIS
 MICHAEL EDWARD ELLIS
 ROBERT J. ELLIS III
 JENIFER N. ELLSWORTH
 MATTHEW P. ELMORE
 BENJAMIN OLIS ELTON
 ANDREW ENGEL
 KURTIS ENGELSON
 MELISSA A. ENGLISH
 BRIAN J. ERICKSON
 DAVID ERKENS
 CHRIS D. ERELEWINE
 DAVID M. ERNST
 NICHOLAS J. ERVIN
 KRISTINE N. ESPINOLA
 DAVID J. ESTREM
 KEVIN M. ETHERTON
 DANIEL J. ETUE
 JUSTIN P. EULBERG
 BRADLEY K. EVANS
 MATTHEW T. EVERS
 RYAN P. EWING
 JOSHUA L. FAILING
 JEFFREY T. FALCONE
 BRIAN S. FALK
 ANDREW P. FAMA
 CORY J. FARRER
 TIMOTHY D. FARWELL
 TIMOTHY FAST
 VANCE FEAVEY
 MATTHEW FEEMAN
 JON P. FELMET
 ZACHARY D. FENNELLS
 JARED P. FERNEAU
 THOMAS W. FERRARA
 JOHN T. FIELD
 ROXANNA M. FIGUEROA
 JORDAN L. FILER
 JENNIFER VAITA FILLMORE
 FREDERICK J. FINKE III
 CHRISTOPHER R. FINKENSTADT
 RYAN D. FINLAYSON
 KELSEY FINLEY

MATTHEW T. FINNEGAN
 JUAN P. FIOL
 TAMARA R. FISCHER CARTER
 THEODORE FISHER
 JOHN R. FITZGERALD
 CHAD G. FLANN
 BRENT D. FLEMING
 KEVIN M. FLEMING
 RUSSELL E. FLEMING
 ADAM FLETCHER
 SHAUN P. FLOERSCH
 COREY J. FLORENDO
 ALICIA A. FOGARTY
 RENEE ELIZABETH FONTENOT
 MATTHEW T. FORBES
 DARIN E. FORD
 THERESA MARIE FORD
 CLINTON J. FORE
 SEAN K. FORSMAN
 ERIC J. FORSYTH
 RALPH GARY FOSHEE, JR.
 ADAM J. FOSSUM
 JESSE C. FOSTER
 EDWARD TAYLOR FRANCIS
 THOMAS J. FRANKEN
 STEVEN FREEMAN
 JONATHAN M. FRENCH
 DONALD E. FREY
 WILLIAM R. FREY
 JONATHAN D. FRIEDMAN
 CHARLES A. FRIESZ
 JOSEPH M. FRITSCHEN
 MICHAEL S. FRITTS
 BRANDON M. FRITZ
 PATRICK L. FROST
 TYRONE S. FROST
 GABRIEL A. FRUSHA
 MATTHEW T. FRY
 MICHAEL A. FRYE
 ALFRED D. FRYMAN III
 JAMES JULIO FUESTES
 THOMAS J. FUGLER
 TRAVIS J. FUGLER
 TIMOTHY P. FULKERSON
 WILLIAM FULLINGTON
 JEFFREY P. FULTON
 CHARLES G. GAFFORD
 OMAR GAMBOA
 ERIC WILLIAM GARCIA
 ORLANDO TOMAS GARCIA
 RUSSELL C. GARDNER
 JUSTIN R. GAREY
 PHILIP N. GARITO, JR.
 REY JAN D. GARMA
 BRYAN P. GARTON
 SILAS W. GASSETT
 GREGORY S. GAUDET
 CHRISTOPHER D. GAUSEPOHL
 JERRY WAYNE GAY
 PATRICK J. GAYNOR
 GEFFREY LYNN GEBHARDT
 PHILIP A. GEDDES
 SARAH E. GEE
 JEREMY R. GEIGER
 BARRY C. GEISE
 PAUL M. GENSGIC
 RYAN D. GEOFFROY
 ANTHONY R. GEORGE
 DUSTIN R. GEORGE
 BRENT H. GESSEL
 DARRELL GIBSON, JR.
 JONATHAN P. GIBSON
 ANDREW L. GIELER
 JONATHAN C. GILBERT
 LORI C. GILBERT
 ROBERT A. GILBERT
 EDWARD J. GILCHRIST
 BRANDON G. GILLET
 JAMES A. GIPF
 FRANK P. GIRDWAIN
 ANDREW J. GLASS
 DAVID N. GLEASON
 PATRICK GLEN
 GARY J. GLOVER
 THOMAS GOBLE
 MARSHA RENEE GOETZ
 DANIEL L. GOFF
 ERIK M. GOFF
 REED H. GOLDBERG
 BRENT FAIRS GOLDEN
 ALEXANDER K. GOLDFEIN
 JOHN H. GOMEZ
 NICHOLAS I. GOMEZ
 BLAKE T. GONZALES
 JACOB M. GONZALES
 JOSEPH GONZALES
 BRIAN A. GONZALEZ
 JUAN ANTONIO GONZALEZ, JR.
 SABRINA L. GONZALEZ
 JEFFREY R. GOODE
 ROBERT J. GOODREAU
 TIMOTHY J. GOODWILLIE
 AMBER L. GOODWIN
 ANDREW S. GORDON
 CHARLENE R. GORDON
 MICHAEL A. GORDON
 NEIL MICHAEL GORHAM
 JASON ROBERT GOSSETT
 JESSICA R. GOTT
 CAMBER L. GOVERNSKI
 IAN GRANIER
 RSHIDA A. GRAVES
 SCOTT H. GRAVES
 BRANDON GRAY
 JEFFERY RYAN GRAY
 MICHAEL ADAM GRAY
 HEATHER GREATTING DUFAUD

EMILY E. GREBENC
 JACOB E. GREEN
 KENNETH L. GREEN
 ERIC B. GREENE
 KIRK W. GREENE
 DANIEL J. GREGORICH
 KEVIN M. GREINER
 JOHN N. GREMMINGER
 KEVIN J. GRENIER
 KYLE GRIEVES
 PAUL A. GRIFFITH
 DIMITRIOS P. GRILLOS
 JOHN A. GRIMES
 ROBERT W. GRIMES
 JUSTIN G. GRIPP
 RUSSELL GRONSKY
 JEFFREY H. GROSSMAN
 CLARK GROSVENOR
 JARED L. GROVE
 COURTNEY L. GROVES
 STEVEN M. GROW
 LENORA L. GRUBB
 CAROLINE MEGAN GUERRINI
 GREGORY M. GUERTIN
 WILLIAM J. GUGELMAN
 LAUREN T. GUIBERT
 BRYAN P. GUIDRY
 JESSICA GUTTRON
 JAMILEE M. GUNNELS
 ANNA E. GUNNGOLKIN
 CHRISTINA H. GUSTAFSON
 JOSEPH M. GUSTAFSON
 WILLIAM L. GUTHRIE IV
 JASON ROBERT GUYETTE
 JOSHUA G. HAACK
 JONATHAN B. HABA
 DAVID ALAN HABBEN
 JACOB D. HABRUN
 JEFFREY W. HADDIN
 LUKE J. HAGN
 BLAKE B. HAJTOVSKY
 BRIAN S. HALE
 MATTHEW J. HALE
 ROBERT E. HALE
 MAKIST W. HALECK
 DANIEL HALL
 JOSHUA N. HALL
 MICHAEL C. HALL
 MICHAEL L. HALL
 NICHOLAS J. HALL
 ELIAS HAJVOBSON
 CHRISTIAN N. HAMILTON
 CLINT S. HAMMER
 COURTNEY TAYLOR HAMPTON
 CARL HANAUER
 JASON HANCOCK
 ERICK DANIEL HANDEGARD
 DAVID HANISCH
 JARED HANN
 JOSEPH A. HANNIGAN
 ROBERT A. HANNUM
 JAY HANSEN
 LAURA R. HANSEN
 DOMINIC MARTIN HANSON
 MARK ANDREW HANUS
 ROBERT N. HARMS
 CAROLE A. HARPER
 KEITH M. HARRIGAN
 KYLE M. HARRINGTON
 CHRISTINA C. HARRIS
 EMILY E. HARRIS
 JAMES ALBERT HARRIS
 JEREMY P. HARRIS
 JOSEPH HARRIS
 LORENZO HARRIS, JR.
 NICHOLAS J. HARRIS
 JAY R. HART
 KAREEN A. HART
 MICHAEL L. HARTFIELD
 FRANCIS T. HARTNETT
 PHILLIP P. HARTNETT
 MATTHEW C. HARVEY
 MICHAEL J. HARVEY
 GRANT B. HARWELL
 JASON T. HASBROUCK
 CHRISTOPHER K. HASEGAWA
 JONATHAN D. HASSELL
 BRIAN C. HASSLER
 ERIC W. HASTINGS
 PHILIP C. HASTINGS
 ROBERT HATALA
 NICHOLAS HARRIS HATCHER
 CELINA F. HATLEBERG
 BENJAMIN J. HAUGER
 MARVIN B. HAUGHTON III
 ADAM E. HAWKINS
 MICHAEL HAWKINS
 STEVEN R. HAWKINS
 PAUL A. HAYES
 JAMES IAN HAYNES
 LUKE R. HAYWAS
 OCTAVIA D. HEARD
 CHRISTOPHER D. HEARNE
 BRUCE L. HEBERT
 DARRYL J. HEBERT, JR.
 NATHAN C. HEDDEN
 AARON B. HEDICER
 JUSTIN F. HEDRICK
 STEPHANIE HEDSTROM
 MICHAEL JOSEPH HEFFERLY
 RYAN G. HEFRON
 BENJAMIN T. HEIDENREICH
 JODI L. HEIDMOUS
 MICHAEL R. HEIMAN
 ELIZABETH A. HEIN
 JOHN C. HEINS
 RYAN D. HEMPERLY

TERRENCE HENDERSON
 WAYNE CHRISTOPHER HENRY
 ANDREA M. HENSHALL
 SCOTT H. HENSLEY
 BRENDON D. HERBECK
 KIM V. HERD
 JONATHAN D. HERMAN
 ERIK P. HERMANSON
 GEORGE L. HERN, JR.
 CHRISTINE C. HERNANDEZ
 RHENSO B. HERNANDEZ
 DAVID R. HERNDON
 NEFTALI HERRADA
 TYLER J. HESS
 JAMES P. HEWETT
 JUSTIN M. HICKEY
 TOLAN D. HICKS
 CASSANDRA R. HIDALGO
 JEREMY M. HIGBEE
 MICHAEL J. HILKERT
 CHRISTOPHER R. HILL
 JEFFREY P. HILL
 RICHELLE N. J. HILL
 GRANT L. HILLMAN
 PETER HINCE
 DAVID G. HIND
 TRISTAN T. HINDERLITER
 MICHAEL S. HINES
 JUSTIN J. HINRICHS
 KEN HIROSE
 JEREMY M. HIRSCH
 RYAN MCHENRY HISEROTE
 TERRY WARREN HJERPE
 MICHAEL A. HOADLEY
 BLAKE R. HOAGLAND
 FRANCIS X. HOAR, JR.
 WELDON J. HOBBS
 MICHAEL W. HOBSON
 JUSTIN LEE HOCHSTEIN
 HANNAH ELIZABETH HOCKING
 HANMERON G. HODGE
 JASON R. HODGES
 MARK W. HODGES
 DAVID B. HODGSON
 JAMES HODGSON
 KENNETH T. HODGSON
 STEPHEN C. HODGSON
 JAMES KIRK HOFFMAN
 NATHANIEL D. HOPMANN
 MICHAEL HOGAN
 JOEL G. HOLDER
 CLAYBURN HOLLAND
 CEDRIC N. HOLLEY II
 PAUL J. HOLLRITH
 JASON M. HOLMAN
 ALBERT W. HOLSONBACK II
 KRISTOPHER C. HOLSTEGE
 MICHAEL J. HOLT
 JULIE A. HONEYCUTT
 JEFFERY L. HOOVER
 BART J. HOPKINS
 MATTHEW J. HOPKINS
 MATTHEW HORLACHER
 WILLIAM D. HORN III
 MARTIN L. HORNE III
 DANIEL HORWITZ
 ANDREW M. HOTT
 GARRETT M. HOUK
 LAJOYCE HOUSE
 CARL NATHAN HOWARD
 SCOTT D. HOWE
 ADAM P. HOWLAND
 JENNIFER P. HOWLAND
 RYAN T. HOWLAND
 DEAN D. HOYT
 MATTHEW THOMAS HOYT
 PAUL M. HRAD
 JEREMY J. HROMSCO
 KRISTI L. HRUPEK
 MASON J. HUBBARD
 TUNISHA TISHWANI HUBBARD
 DEREK J. HUBER
 NOEL A. HUDLESTON
 ELIZABETH HUDSON
 MITCHELL C. HUDSON
 ROBERT K. HUGHES
 SHAMAN HUGHES
 ERIC SCOTT HUGHETT
 HECTOR HUGUET
 NDEL A. HUMBER
 KEVIN T. HUMBERT
 JAMES M. HUMPHREY
 ANDREW O. HUNSTOCK
 ADAM J. HUNTINGTON
 SCOTT E. HUNTLEY
 MICHAEL D. HUNTLEY
 TRAVIS DON HUSABOE
 MICHAEL CHRISTOPHER HUTCHINS
 JARED KENNETH HUTTER
 BRADLEY S. HYATT
 RACHEL A. IANACONE
 JEFFREY J. IANACCONE
 JOHN D. IHRIG
 BRIAN WILLIAM ILES
 JHAMES ILLANEZ
 SHAWN M. ILTIS
 MELISSA C. INGRAM
 ERIC T. INKENBRANDT
 LAURA A. ISALY
 LIDIA IYASSU
 CHRISTOPHER ALLEN IZELL
 CHRISTOPHER R. JACKSON
 DANIEL B. JACKSON
 FREDERICK H. JACKSON
 PHILIP C. JACKSON
 CHRISTOPHER M. JACOBSON
 GABRIEL S. JACOBSON

CHRISTOPHER B. JAMES
 CHRISTOPHER KEVIN JAMES
 PATRICK ALLAN JAMES
 TIMOTHY L. JAMES
 MICHAEL A. JAMIESON
 NICHOLAS J. JAMROZ
 ANTHONY J. JANNAZO
 KYLE JUSTIN JANSEN
 MARK G. JANSEN
 CELIA M. JARRATT
 ERIC T. JEANNOT
 CHARLES S. JELLIFFE
 KRISTEN M. JENKINS
 MATTHEW JENKINS
 JANELLE V. JENNIGES
 CHRISTOPHER L. JEROME
 ANDREW D. JERZ
 CHARLES W. JESSE, JR.
 MICHAEL E. JOANOS
 RYAN R. JOBMAN
 CHRISTOPHER R. JOERS
 MARC E. JOHANSEN
 BUDDY C. JOHNS
 ANDREAS H. JOHNSEN
 ALEXIS R. JOHNSON
 AMBER M. JOHNSON
 BRENT ALLEN JOHNSON
 BRIAN T. JOHNSON
 CARL HEATH JOHNSON
 CLIFTON H. JOHNSON
 DARRIS L. JOHNSON
 EMILIA JOHNSON
 JASON L. JOHNSON
 JOSHUA D. JOHNSON
 OLIN JOHNSON
 TYLER A. JOHNSON
 ZACHARY S. JOHNSON
 ZELLA L. JOHNSON
 PATRICK WAYNE JOHNSTON
 AARON M. JONES
 ARTHUR J. JONES
 BRANDON R. JONES
 DAVID W. JONES
 DUSTIN P. JONES
 MATTHEW D. JONES
 MATTHEW S. JONES
 LOREN N. JONESHARRIS
 NICHOLAS B. JORDAN
 ANGELA SUSANN JOY RADDEN
 MARIE S. JUAN ROQUE
 DANIEL R. JUCHCINSKI
 ERIC C. JUDD
 JARROD L. JUDD
 KRISTOPHER A. JUHL
 PAUL JULIAN, JR.
 SAMUEL S. JUN
 NICHOLAS JUREWICZ
 NATHAN WAYNE JURGENS
 JENNIFER N. KAISER
 ERIK D. KAPPE
 LESLIE L. KASTROP
 LISA A. KAZAKOS
 BENJAMIN J. KEARNEY
 MATTHEW J. KELLEN
 ALEXANDER J. KELLER
 SCOTT C. KELLERMAN
 ERIC F. KELLOOG
 JEFFREY M. KELLOGG
 ALEXANDER M. KELLY
 BRYAN S. KELLY
 TRAVIS C. KENNEBECK
 MICHAEL J. KENNEDY
 RICHARD S. KERR
 MICHAEL M. KERSCHBAUM
 MEGAN L. KESSEN
 KAMRAN M. KHALIDI
 JAMES O. KILLIAN
 WESTON D. KILLIAN
 ANTHONY Y. KIM
 NICOLAS R. KIM
 TAE HOON KIM
 DANIEL KIMBALL
 ANGELA M. KIMLER
 BENJAMIN R. KING
 BRADLEY M. KING
 DAVID W. KING, JR.
 JEREMIAH DANIEL KING
 LUKE V. KIRKLAND
 RUSSELL J. KIRKLIN
 AARON W. KISER
 MICHAEL G. KISSINGER
 SARAH A. KAESER FERNANDEZ
 THOMAS B. KLEIN
 JOHN A. KLEINSCHMIDT
 RORY E. KLEPPER
 MARSHALL W. KLITZKE
 DANIEL W. KNAPP MILLER
 MICHAEL W. KNATUP
 MATTHEW D. KNEPPER
 TIMOTHY R. KNEFFEL
 DANIEL K. KNOSS
 BRADLEY MARSHALL KOCH
 TIMOTHY KOGGE
 KEVIN R. KOLB
 MARCUS J. KOLLROSS
 JAMES P. KOLZOW
 STANISLAV V. KOMITOV
 DAVID KOPP
 JOSHUA W. KORZILIUS
 JODY RAY KOSCHMANN
 MAURICIO KOSSLER
 TERRY L. KOSTELIC, JR.
 AARON D. KOTLOWSKI
 BRANDON R. KOVELL
 MATTHEW KOWALSKI
 MICHAEL B. KRAUSE
 DANIEL BRENT KREHER

KYLE W. KREMER
 CHRISTINA P. KREPS
 RANDALL J. KREPS
 MATTHEW BRIAN KRISAK
 AARON KRIZEK
 DANIEL J. KRUNGLEVICH
 THOMAS L. KUBLER
 JONATHAN S. KULAK
 NICOLE G. KUMP
 BENJAMIN D. KUSTER
 MATTHEW J. KUTA
 EDWARD H. KWON
 RAQUEL ZARAGOZA LA BARR
 ERIC J. LAAKE
 MICHAEL J. LABARBERA
 TIMOTHY F. LABINSKI
 NIRAV D. LAD
 BRIAN A. LADD
 EMILY D. LADD
 ANDREW LAFOUNTAIN
 CULLEN WAYNE LAM
 CHRISTOPHER LAMKEY
 JONATHAN B. LAMOREUX
 CHRISTIAN LANDON
 TROY LEVAR LANE
 DINEAN H. LANG
 CHRISTOPHER M. LANGLEY
 DAVID L. LANKFORD
 LIONEL P. LANUZA
 STEPHEN LANZOLA
 JASON DANIEL LARISH
 CHANCELLOR A. LARRACUENTE
 CHRISTOPHER R. LARSEN
 BRETT M. LARSON
 BRIAN A. LASSITER
 PAUL A. LATOUR
 CHRISTOPHER LAWLER
 SAMUEL JAMES LAWRENCE
 JOSHUA SCOTT LAWSON
 MATTHEW LAWTON
 JOSEPH R. LAY
 MATTHEW S. LAYMAN
 PHUOCHUE THI LE
 PATRICK T. LEARY
 BRIANA E. LEE
 DARREN F. LEE
 MIN Y. LEE
 NICHOLAS A. LEE
 ROBERT W. LEE
 STEVEN B. LEE
 THOMAS W. LEE
 TRENT WAYNE LEEPER
 ROBERT J. LEESE
 ETHAN C. LEFEBVRE
 LUCAS W. LEFEVER
 ABRAHAM J. LEHMANN
 JEFFREY S. LEHMKUHL
 ABRAHAM M. LEIGH
 TROY JOSEPH LEIKER
 BRIAN J. LEMAY
 JESSICA L. LEMKE
 CHRISTOPHER K. LEONG
 DEVIN KWAI HUNG LEONG
 MARK B. LESAR
 JEFFREY S. LESSORD
 JOEL R. LEVILLIE
 DAVID LEVENE
 JORDAN C. LEVINE
 BRIAN G. LEWIS
 CHARLTON D. LEWIS II
 RYAN C. LEY
 JOHN J. LIEBER
 ALEXANDER R. LIGGETT
 NATHANIEL L. LIGHTFOOT
 JOSEPH M. LILES IV
 CHRISTOPHER P. LILGEBERG
 JACOB A. LILLICH
 ANTHONY E. LIN
 ASHLEY J. LINCOLN
 SCOTT ALAN LINDQUIST
 MICHAEL A. LINGER
 JAMES A. LINCHEAN
 MATTHEW LINTKER
 AARON M. LINTON
 FREDERICK C. LITTLE, JR.
 LUCAS P. LOBO
 JOHN R. LOCKARD
 JONATHAN D. LOHR
 REBECCA M. LOGAN
 WILLIAM A. LOHAN
 THOMAS P. LOHMEYER
 BRIAN R. LONG
 DUSTIN A. LONG
 MICHAEL K. LONG
 NICHOLAS C. LONGO
 DANIEL JAMES LONGSTREET
 ANDREW C. LOSER
 READA MATTHEW LOPER
 ERIN M. LOPEZ
 JAMES MARCUS LOPEZ
 MICHAEL LOPEZ
 AUTUMN M. LORENZ
 CHRISTOPHER J. LOVE
 MORRIS LOVE
 BENJAMIN A. LOWE
 CHRISTOPHER D. LOWE
 JAHAYRA LOWE
 JACQUELINE POSTELL LUCAS
 ERIK LUGO ESCOBAR
 CHRISTINE M. LUKASIK
 AARON D. LYNN
 JOHNNY E. LYNUM II
 JEREMY M. MABRY
 ROBERT B. MACDERMOTT
 ANDREW T. MACDONALD
 DOUGLAS MACDONALD

JUSTIN R. MACE
 MELANIE E. MACE
 JOHN MACHUCA
 KATHERINE C. MACK
 ANDREW J. MACKENZIE
 BENJAMIN D. MACKAY
 JAY D. MACLEAN
 ASHLEY N. MAHER
 CAMERON MAHER
 MATTHEW JAMES MAIER
 KATHRYN M. MAITREJEAN
 NATHAN C. MALAFA
 PETER RICHARD MALLOW
 JAMES W. MALLOY
 JUSTIN B. MALMSTROM
 KEVIN MANIS
 MATTHEW J. MANSELL
 EDWARD A. MANTANONA, JR.
 CHRISTIAN L. MAPP
 JENNIFER A. MAPP
 RICHARD W. MARBY
 EVAN J. MARCHETTI
 DAVID M. MARCUS
 ANDREW P. MARSHALL
 COLIN P. MARSHALL
 TREMAYNE V. MARSHALL
 KELLY MARTIN
 KIEL M. MARTIN
 KYLE E. MARTIN
 MARGRET T. MARTIN
 RICHARD A. MARTIN
 CHRISTOPHER R. MARTINEZ
 RONALDO MARTINEZ, JR.
 SAMANTHA M. MARTINEZ
 JOSEPH J. MARUSKA
 JEREMY ALLEN MARY
 ROBERT S. MASEK
 ALISHA N. MASON
 ERWIN E. MASON, JR.
 CASEY M. MASTLEY
 JESSICA M. MATES
 MATTHEW F. MATIS
 JAHARA W. MATISEK
 ADAM DAVID MATTHEIS
 KELLY MATTHEW
 KYLE R. MATTHEW
 ADAM JAMES MATUSZAK
 KEVIN E. MAUERSBERG
 BRIAN MAUNTEL
 BRADLEY G. MAXON
 TIMOTHY J. MAY
 MITCHELL MAYES
 CHRISTOPHER M. MAYO
 VICTORIA J. MAYO
 KIMANI A. MAYS
 NICHOLAS MAZULA
 KENNETH H. MAZUREK
 PATRICK P. MCCANDREW
 AARON R. MCBRIDE
 DONALD ROBERT MCCAFFERY
 CHRISTOPHER B. MCCALL
 JOHN R. MCCANN
 LOUIS MCCANTS
 CHRISTOPHER MCCARTHY
 RYAN J. MCCAUGHAN
 EVAN T. MCCAULEY
 CHRISTOPHER D. MCCONNELL
 SEAN R. MCCONNELL
 SEAN C. MCCONVILLE
 MATT D. MCCORMACK
 JACLYN MARIE MCCORMICK
 MATTHIAS MCCORMICK
 DARYL L. MCCOY
 JOSHUA D. MCCRARY
 ISAAC MCCRAY
 DANE C. MCCREARY
 JUSTIN M. MCCULLOUGH
 AARON J. MCCURDY
 GREGORY A. MCDADE
 JONATHAN P. MCDONALD
 RYAN D. MCDONALD
 BRYAN J. MCGARRY
 TRAVIS E. MCGARRY
 DAVID A. MCGHEE
 CHARLYNNE M. MCGINNIS
 MICHAEL J. MCKAY
 KEITH D. MCKEE
 SEAN R. MCKEE
 EVAN W. MCKINNEY
 BRANDON S. MCKINNON
 THOMAS B. MCKNIGHT
 CHRISTINE TODD MCLEAN
 JAMES S. MCLEAN
 CHARLES B. MCCLERAN
 PATRICK W. MCMORROW
 MATTHEW M. MCMURTRY
 JEREMY B. MCPHERSON
 JONATHAN C. MCPHILAMY
 STEVEN B. MCSWAIN
 KAREN A. MEALBY
 ERIC ALLEN MEISGER
 MAZEN A. MEHIO
 BENJAMIN D. MEIER
 MARC S. MEIER
 GLENN M. MELEEN
 JONATHAN ELISHA MENASHI
 CANDIDO T. MENDES, JR.
 EDDIE A. MENDEZLLOVET
 CHRISTOPHER S. MENDOZA
 JESUS MENDOZA
 ISSYAS H. MENGISTU
 KIRLANDO MENSEN
 BRADY J. MERRILL
 FRED M. MERRILL
 ALEC W. MESSERALL
 DEVON M. MESSICK
 THOMAS EDWARD METZGER

GUY G. MEYER
 JUSTIN N. MEYER
 PAUL F. MEYER
 NOAH MICHAEL
 DENISE M. MICHAELS
 NEAL MIEST
 BRENT J. MILES
 ALLEN R. MILLER
 CHRISTOPHER J. MILLER
 JESSE P. MILLER
 JOHN V. MILLER
 JONATHAN M. MILLER
 JOSHUA L. MILLER
 LYNDEL MILLER
 MATTHEW P. MILLER
 PHILLIP R. MILLER
 RYAN T. MILLER
 SAMANTHA M. MILLER
 DAVID C. MILODRAGOVICH
 JACOB EDWARD MISENICK
 LAMAR SCOTT MISTER
 ANTHONY B. MITCHELL
 JEFFREY R. MITCHELL
 RYAN MATTHEW MOBLEY
 KAREN A. MOCK
 ROBBY J. MODAD
 KYLE M. MODELL
 MICHAEL D. MOFFITT
 MICHAEL D. MOHR
 JOSEPH G. MONTORO
 KENT C. MOODY
 STEPHEN MINHO MOON
 KEITH G. MOORE
 KENT N. MOORE
 THOMAS W. MOORE
 MARK A. MORALES
 LUIS A. MORALESREYES
 BENJAMIN P. MORAN
 GREGORY MORAN
 CHRISTIAN H. MORGAN
 HARREL M. MORGAN
 ROBERT P. MORGAN
 NICHOLAS L. MORGANS
 ERIC MORRIS
 JOSHUA L. MORRIS
 CHRISTOPHER T. MORRISON
 DANIEL P. MORRISSEY
 JUSTIN A. MOSER
 DAVID A. MOTT, JR.
 STEPHEN D. MOTT
 MATTHEW MOTTET
 DAVID L. MUELLER
 WILLIAM MUIR
 PATRICK J. MULLEN
 DENNIS J. MULLER II
 JUSTIN M. MULLER
 ANTOINE N. MUNFAKH
 SHELDON A. MUNNS
 MARGELL MUNOZ
 DAVID J. MURLEY
 AUDIE J. MURPHY
 JOSEPH C. MURPHY
 MICHAEL C. MURPHY
 PATRICK MICHAEL MURPHY
 RYAN D. MURPHY
 ELIZABETH A. MUSIC
 ERIC LEE MYATT
 JOHN WILLIAM MYERS, JR.
 MICHAEL M. MYERS
 BRADLEY R. NADOLNY
 CHRISTOPHER M. NAIL
 DANIAL S. NAIM
 JUSTIN TYLER NAKAMURA
 ADAM LEE NAKATA
 WILLIAM L. NAINNA
 DENNIS M. NAPIER
 CHRISTOPHER NARVAEZ
 CHRISTOPHER K. NARY
 CHRISTOPHER J. NASTAL
 OMAR A. NAVA
 TRAVIS D. NEAL
 WILLIAM M. NEECE
 LAURIE L. NEIDER
 DAVID A. NELSON
 DOUGLAS J. NELSON
 JOEL D. NELSON
 RYAN R. NESS
 CRAIG H. NEUMAN
 WILLIAM J. NEWBY
 IAN A. NEWCOMB
 JOHN P. NEWMAN
 MILES ALEXANDER NEWSOME
 MICHAEL F. NEWSON
 MARK D. NEXON
 CHISALA C. NGANDWE
 TAN ANH NGO
 TUNG THANH HUYNH NGO
 TIN T. NGUYEN
 VANESSA N. NICHOLS
 DANIEL T. NIEDERHAUSER
 JOEL NIEMAN
 PAUL J. NIETO
 PHILIP A. NIGHTINGALE
 WILFRED E. NOEL
 JONATHAN RYAN NOONAN
 CRAIG M. NORDGREN
 KEITH A. NORDQUEST
 VERA J. NORTHCUTT
 CHRISTINA A. NORTON
 MATTHEW T. NOVOTNEY
 MICHAEL PAUL NOWAKOWSKI
 PAMELA J. NUILA
 RACHAEL L. NUSSBAUM
 JACQUELINE A. NYBERG
 CHARLYNDA NYENKE
 CHRISTINA J. OBERGFELL
 YOLANDA A. OBEY

EDEMUMO K. OBOHO
CHRISTOPHER G. OBRANOVICH
GAVIN P. OBRIEN
KEVIN OBYRNE
JONATHAN C. ODELL
GORDON F. OLDE, JR.
STEVEN D. OLIN
AARON EDWARD OLIVER
DELL T. OLMSTEAD
THOMAS S. OLNEY
JESSICA MARIE OLSON
ANGELA M. ONEAL
DANIEL Y. ONEAL
TOMOYUKI D. ONO
ISAIAH L. OPPELAAR
JAVIER ORAMA
RODOLFO A. OROZCO
ALEXANDER A. ORTIONA
AMBER N. ORTIZ
MARK A. OSBECK
JEFFREY R. OSBORNE
JEFFREY S. OSGOOD
MATTHEW T. OSGOOD
THOMAS M. OSGOOD
RYAN T. OSTLER
SCOTT OSTROW
MARK M. OVERMAN
JUSTIN M. OVERMYER
TREVOR K. OWEN
RICHARD A. OWENS IV
JIMMY M. OXENDINE, JR.
STEPHEN C. PACE
BENHUR ESPLAGO PACER, JR.
JEFFREY T. PACINI
MICHAEL D. PACINI
NATHAN E. PADGETT
JACLYN PADILLA MELTON
JOHN H. PAEK
CHAIAS A. PAIVA
DANIEL P. PALLISTER
WILLIAM J. PALM
ADAM S. PALMER
ERIC B. PALMER
CHRISTOPHER M. PAPPAS
PAUL A. PAPPAS
JEFFREY RAYMOND PAQUETTE
CANDACE N. PARK
JACOB R. PARKER
SANDRA A. PARKER
SHAWNA W. PARKER
WARREN C. PARKER
SCOTT G. PARKS
EVAN C. PARKS
PATRICK R. PARRISH
JENNIFER L. PARTRIDGE
KYLE W. PASLAY
BIRJU HABESHCHAN PATEL
HIREN JAYANTI PATEL
GERALD S. PATTON
TRAVIS PATTON
SETH E. PAULSEN
CHRISTOPHER S. PAXTON
JOSHUA A. PAYNE
STEVEN PAYNE
SHIRISHA W. PEAKE
CALEB B. PELGER
JENALIE N. PELLETIER
SETH A. PELLETIER
CASEY PELLIZZARI
JOSE HUMBERTO PERALES, JR.
PABLO M. PEREZ
RIGOBERTO F. PEREZ
ANTHONY A. PERONE
JULES JOSEPH PERRIE, JR.
BRENTON W. PERRY
MARK C. PERRY
MICHAEL E. PERRY
ELLI US PERONS
ADAM JOHN PERYEA
CHARLENE S. PETERS
KENNETH PETERS
BRIANNE PETERSEN
NEIL A. PETERSEN
CHRISTOPHER D. PETERSON
JAMES PETERSON
MOLLY N. PETERSON
STEVEN M. PETERSON
NICK V. PETTIT
THOMAS PETYKOWSKI
STEVEN J. PFU
MEGAN L. PFLUG
HENRY E. PFLUGRADT III
KEITH V. PHILAPHANDETH
CASEY D. PHIPPS
MICHAEL PIAZZA
ANDREW T. PICKERING
NICHOLAS PIER
CARLOS PINEDO
DANIEL M. PIPER
ANDREW D. PISUT
ABIGAIL F. PLATT
PEETER E. PLEAKETAMM
JODIE J. PLEISCH
OAK WARREN PLESTED
MICHAEL J. PLUGER
WILBURN R. POE, JR.
BRENTON K. POMEROY
KEVIN B. POND
DAVID C. PONTIUS
BENJAMIN ROY POOLE
FORREST L. POOLE
MICHAEL E. POOLE
MICAH J. PORTER
KATHERINE IRENE PORTILLO
BRIAN JEFFREY POTTER
CHRISTOPHER W. POTTS
JOSHUA MACK POULTON

JASON POWELL
MICHAEL HUNTER POWELL
ANDREW T. POWER
ANDREW P. POWERS
SEAN L. POWERS
DAYVID M. PRAHL
CHRISTOPHER A. PRENTISS
ROBERT P. PRENTON
JACOB WAYNE PRESLEY
DAVID PRESTWICH
DONALD T. PREY
JOHN A. PRIESTLY III
RENE O. PRIETO, JR.
THOMAS M. PRITCHETT
BRIAN D. PRIVETTE
ZACHARY A. PROBST
JENNIFER L. PROUTY
AUSTIN M. PRUNEDA
BRUCE ROBERT PUF AHL, JR.
STEVEN L. PUGH
STEVEN MICHAEL PUGH
SHEENA M. PULEALI
NICHOLAS M. PULIRE
JEDEDIAH R. PURCELL
WILLIAM M. PURCELL
ANTHONY PURDY
LANETTA R. PURNELLADAMS
JOHN H. QUERL IV
CLAY C. QUINBY
JOSHUA J. QUINN
MICHAEL J. QUINN
JOHN D. RABUN
CAMERON M. RADON
ANDREW T. RADZICKI
HERMAN L. RAINEY III
NICHOLAS J. RALLO
MICHAEL RAMAMURTHY
SAUL A. RAMOS
BENJAMIN W. RAMSEY
RICHARD M. RANACHOWSKI, JR.
DANIEL S. RAND
DEREK R. RANKIN
STACY WILLIAMS RANKIN
KABIR S. RAO
JASON C. RAUCLIFF
JORGE ENRIQUE RATIVA HOWARD
ERIK G. RAUGLAS
ERIC C. RAY
MICHAEL P. RAYKOWSKI
STEVEN RAYMER
MATTHEW P. READ
RYAN A. REBUCK
MATTHEW O. REDAJA
NICHOLAS C. REDENIUS
ANDREW R. REED
DANIEL S. REED
DYLAN A. REED
HENRY F. REED
MAXIMILIEN H. REELE
PAULA K. REELE
JONATHAN C. REEVES
KYLE J. REICHERT
KENT B. REICHL
KEVIN D. REKEDAL
ANTHONY A. RENDON
CHRISTOPHER M. RENNINGER
PHILIP RENTZ
MICHAEL V. RESS
CHRISTOPHER REVEIZ
JONATHAN C. REY
ADAN RAY REYES
RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS
THOMAS J. REYNOLDS III
THOMAS S. REYNOLDS
MICHAEL J. RICHARDS
DANIEL RICHARDSON
SEAN RICHARDSON
KEVIN C. RIDDEL
MELISSA K. RIESTER
ROBBIN W. RIESTER
JUSTIN C. RIGGS
DAVID M. RIGGS
MATTHIEU A. RIGOLLET
TAYLOR S. RIGOLLET
ERIC N. RINGELSTETTER
BRYSON M. RINTALA
PATRICK L. RIS
SCHNEIDER RIESLIN
ANNETTE O. RIVAS
ERNEST D. RIVERA
JOHNATHAN ROBBINS
MATTHEW L. ROBERTSON
BRYANT ADAM ROBERTS
JAMES T. ROBERTS
PALMER L. ROBERTS
PATRICK EVERETT ROBERTS
BRIAN A. ROBERTSON
JASON M. ROBERTSON
JUSTIN ROBINSON
KIMBERLY J. ROBINSON
JENNIFER S. ROCK
ROBERT J. ROCK
ANTONIO D. RODRIGUEZ
DOUGLAS I. RODRIGUEZ
ISAAC RODRIGUEZ
NICHOLAS KIM RODRIGUEZ
DUSTIN R. ROGERS
THEODORE J. ROGERS
JOHN J. ROH
GREGORY E. ROHMILLER
STEPHEN F. ROHRBACHER
ASHLEY E. ROLFE
THADDEUS L. BONNAU
JOSHUA S. ROPE
WILLIAM B. ROSADO
MICHAEL B. ROSE
DERRICK B. ROSENBERGER

SCOTT M. ROSENBLUM
KEITH J. ROSS
BRANDON ROTH
BRANDON L. ROTH
WESLEY C. ROUNSAVILLE
MICHAEL T. ROY
DAVID RUIZ
ANDREA D. RUMPLE
JENNIFER J. RUPP
CHRISTOPHER L. RUSSELL
JAMES E. RUSSELL
KRISTIN M. RUSSELL
TANISHA J. RUSSELL
BRIAN MICHAEL RUTT
TRAVIS W. RYAN
PETER A. SABATOWSKI
MICHAEL J. SACKENHEIM
MARCUS A. SAGASTUME
DAVID ORDINARIO SAMPAYAN
MATTHEW STEPHEN SAMPSON
ANNA M. SAN MIGUEL
JASON M. SANCHEZ
MATTHEW TIMOTHY SANDERS
RENA M. SANDGREN
KIRBY A. SANFORD
MATTHEW SANFORD
DANIEL S. SANTIAGO
SETH M. SARDUY
MATTHEW RYAN SASSER
AMANDA M. SATER
BRIAN W. SAWYERS
JASON P. SCALZITTI
DAVID JAMES SCHADWINKEL
JASON SCHAUB
WILLIAM A. SCHEELE
SCOTT M. SCHEPPE
PAUL SCHEGLOV
JOHN C. SCHILLING
DAVID M. SCHIMKE II
STEPHEN A. SCHNEDWOLF
JONATHAN K. SCHISLER
ADAM G. SCHMIDT
BRIAN M. SCHMIDT
KALUN JEFFERY SCHMIDT
MARK A. SCHMIDT
DAVID R. SCHMITT
GINA M. SCHNEIDER
JOSEPH SCHNEIDER
KEVIN R. SCHOLZ
MATTHEW E. SCHOOMAKER
ANDREW J. SCHRAAG
DANIEL O. SCHREIBER
CLAYTON W. SCHUETTY
WILLIAM MORRIS SCHUH
NICHOLAS T. SCHULTE
PATRICK JOSEPH SCHUTTE
CURTIS J. SCHWARZ
CHARLES K. SCHIARINI
DOUGLAS C. SCIORTINO
JARROLD SCOGGIN
AARON L. SCOGGIN
ALISHA M. SCOTT
BRIAN F. SCOTT
CHRISTIN M. SCOTT
RYAN C. SCOTT
GARY S. SCULLIN
JAMES T. SCYOCURKA
RACHEL E. SEABLOM
BENJAMIN H. SEABOUGH
RAYMOND T. SEALEY
JONATHAN D. SEALEY
DOUGLAS R. SEELEY
JEFFERSON O. SEGUIN
MATTHEW SEIDERS
DIERK A. SEIFERT
TREVOR A. SEILING
RUPINDER SINGH SEKHON
BEN J. SELP
ANDREW J. SELLERS
MARGARET S. SERIG
REINA SERINCO
HAROLD F. SHAM
JOSEPH SHANON III
URI C. SHANSKE
PHILIP A. SHAPIRO
JOHN J. SHARKEY, JR.
JEFFREY A. SHAW
ROBERT KEVIN SHAW
PETER C. SHAYBORN
BRIAN PATRICK SHEA
THOMAS P. SHEA, JR.
TRAVIS H. SHEETS
SHANE J. SHEFFIELD
RYAN W. SHELHORSE
MATTHEW A. SHELLY
PETER CHRISTIAN SHELTON
REGINALD P. SHELTON
WILLIAM J. SHELTON
JOEL T. SHEPHERD
AARON D. SHERMAN
BENJAMIN D. SHERMAN
JENNIFER B. SHERMAN
TROY H. C. SHETTLESWORTH
JONATHAN D. SHIFLETT
BRIAN A. SHIMEK
TRACI S. SHIRAITSHI
JUAN R. SIANCASTAO
SEAN OMAR SIDDIQUI
JORDAN SITTERI
JASON B. SIKORSKI
JASON G. SILVA
RYAN J. SILVA
ADRIAN SIMENTAL
JUSTIN SIMMONS
BENJAMIN D. SIMON
SETH BASIL SIMPSON IV
MALINDA SINGLETON

ERIC J. SIPOS
 NATHAN E. SKAGGS
 BRETT M. SKATES
 AUSTIN B. SKELLEY
 TIMOTHY J. SKYPECK
 DARIN M. SLAGA
 STUART M. SLATTERY
 MICHAEL A. SLAUGHTER
 CALEB SLAYTON
 ANTHONY J. SLIGAR
 BENJAMIN R. SMITH
 BOYD SMITH
 DAVID N. SMITH
 EDITH E. SMITH
 JONATHAN Z. SMITH
 JUSTIN M. SMITH
 KENNETH J. SMITH
 KIMBERLY D. SMITH
 MATTHEW C. SMITH
 MICHAEL T. SMITH
 NICHOLAS C. SMITH
 PETER M. SMITH
 RONNIE R. SMITH
 SIERRA M. SMITH
 TROY M. SMITH
 WARREN S. SMITH III
 CHRISTOPHER D. SMOROL
 MATTHEW SODERLUND
 TROY M. SOEDER
 JOSEPH E. SOLANO
 RICARDO S. SOLANO
 NICHOLAS M. SOMERMAN
 JICHUL SONG
 GARY J. SOWA
 JARED J. SPEER
 MICHAEL J. SPENCER
 LAWRENCE J. SPINA, JR.
 MATT S. SPINELLI
 MATTHEW J. SPITLER
 EDMUND SPIVAK
 CHAD ANDREW ST. ARNAULD
 DAVID N. ST. LOUIS
 PAUL J. STADELBACHER
 MEGAN A. STANDIFER
 ROBERT A. STANFIELD
 COURTLAND W. STANLEY
 THOMAS J. STAR
 SEAN DANIEL STAVELEY
 LINDON H. STEADMAN
 TIMOTHY A. STEARMAN
 WILLIAM D. STEININGERHOLMES
 DONNA MICHELLE STEINKE
 BRIAN L. STEORTS
 MICHAEL A. STEPAN
 CHRISTOPHER B. STEPANEK
 CHRISTOPHER D. STEPHEN
 ANGELA L. STEPHENS
 MICHAEL R. STEWARD
 JESSICA STEWART
 JAMA K. STILWELL
 ANDREW J. STIMPSON
 BRANDON STOKER
 LISA A. STOKEY
 CASON D. STONE
 DEREK J. STORBECK
 LUKE R. STOVER
 JOSHUA A. STRAFACCIA
 WILLIAM C. STREETH
 CHARLES C. STRETH, JR.
 BRANDON KIRK STRICKLAND
 ZACARY SCOTT STRICKLAND
 DAVID E. STRINGER
 JOSHUA S. STRONG
 MATTHEW STRONGIN
 JOHN L. STRUBE, JR.
 REHEMA L. STUCKEY
 JONATHAN DOUGLAS STUECKLE
 JOHN Z. STUKAVEC
 AARON M. STUMPF
 TREVOR VINCENT STUTTING
 JEREMY J. STUURSMAN
 LARA JOY STYLES SMITH
 NATHANIEL ISIAH SUKOLSKY
 PAUL S. SULA
 DANIEL W. SULLIVAN
 GREGORY D. SULLIVAN
 RYAN SULLIVAN
 SARAH SUMMERS
 BRIAN L. SUMP
 AMANDA SUNDERLAND
 JONATHAN E. SUNDMAN
 PETER L. SURETTE, JR.
 ANTHONY A. SURINMA
 JOSHUA THOMAS SUTTLIFF
 TIMOTHY P. SUTPHEN
 STEPHEN A. SWARTZ
 ALLYN L. SWAVELEY, JR.
 STEVEN P. SWEET II
 ERIC J. SWENSON
 BRYAN K. SWIERENGA
 COULETTE C. SWIGGETT
 PETER J. SWINSON
 WILLIAM B. SWOAPE
 RYAN Z. SZMAJDA
 KORINNE K. TAKEYAMA
 MATTHEW E. TARNOWSKI
 DEAN R. TATE
 JASON ALLEN TAYLOR
 KARA TAYLOR
 MATTHEW W. TAYLOR
 MICHAEL A. TAYLOR
 RUSH HENRY TAYLOR
 RYAN R. TAYLOR
 SETH TAYLOR
 WILLIAM STEPHAN TAYLOR
 IAN W. TEGARDEN
 JEFFREY A. TEEL

MARIO H. TELLEZ
 KATHLEEN M. TENPENNY
 NATHAN C. TERRAZONE
 SUSAN H. TERRELL
 RYAN L. TERVO
 ALICIA MARIE THALHOFER
 BRIAN A. THALHOFER
 APRIL R. THEOBALD
 KRISTINE E. THICKSTUN
 JEREMIAH THOM
 CULLEN R. THOMAS
 DANIEL R. THOMAS
 KEVIN T. THOMAS
 JEFFERY ALLEN THOMASON
 JOSEPH L. THOMER
 CHRISTOPHER M. THOMPSON
 JESSE C. THOMPSON
 MATTHEW A. THOMPSON
 NOLAN R. THOMPSON
 SCOTT MICHAEL THOMPSON
 SCOTT R. THOMSON
 ROBERT FRANCIS THORNTON
 ANNALÉE A. THURBER
 PATRICK R. TIBBALS
 TERRELL K. TILLERY
 BRENT S. TITTLE
 GEORGE MICHAEL TOBIAS
 JEREMY R. TOBIAS
 JOHN C. TOMASKOVIC III
 DAVID W. TOMLINSON
 TRAVIS R. TOMPKINS
 ERIK R. TORGUSON
 JOSE MANUEL TORRECH
 ERICA ETTER TORTELLA
 TORI LEIGH NERNEY TOUZIN
 CRAIG S. TOWLSON
 SCOTT A. TRACY
 HUY H. TRAN
 VUONG M. TRAN
 JOSHUA TAYLOR TRANTHAM
 KIP ALAN TRAUSSCH
 KONRAD L. TRAUTMAN
 MARY R. TRAUTWEIN
 ROBERTO ANTONIO TREJO
 MICHAEL A. TRETIT
 TIMOTHY W. TRIMAILLO
 BENJAMIN N. TRUAX
 MARCUS D. TRUMAN
 TIMOTHY A. TRYON
 JUSTIN M. TUBIOLLO
 BARRY M. TUCKER
 JAMES T. TUCKER
 JEFFREY TUCKER
 PAUL ANTHONY TUCKER
 TRAVIS J. TUCKER
 AMANDA D. TURCOTTE
 ALEXANDER J. TURNER
 WILLIAM M. TURNER
 RYAN A. TURONIK
 STEVEN E. TUTAJ
 JOSHUA A. TWEEDY
 MICHAEL J. TWINING
 BRANDON M. UEKI
 PATRICK J. UHES
 JONATHAN D. UHLER
 JANEL F. UTTERWYK
 JASON S. ULBARRU
 GREGORY D. ULRICH
 ROBERT MARTIN UMHOLTZ
 SARA R. UNDEUTSCH
 ZACHARY D. UNGER
 KEVIN MICHAEL UNKS
 SIDNEY J. USRY
 MARK W. VAHLE
 JOSHUA T. VAHOVIUS
 ELIZABETH H. VALASEK
 WILLEM R. VAN LOON
 JON VAN NOSTRAND
 ADAM C. VANCE
 TRAVIS J. VANCE
 JOHN F. VANDENBEMDEN
 JEFFREY P. VANDERHYDE
 ALEXANDER D. VANLEAR
 MATTHEW VANTHOMPSON
 CHRISTOPHER M. VANZOEEST
 ALLEN J. VARGHESE
 MARSHALIA M. VAUGHANS
 EDSON L. VEGLIO
 ALFRED ALVAREZ VELASQUEZ, JR.
 ALBERTO VELEZ
 CHRISTOPHER R. VELLA
 LUDELL VIBAL
 BRANDON DAMIEN VIGNERON
 PATRICK A. VILLA
 JOSHUA M. VILLALOBOS
 ROMMEL O. VILLANUEVA
 DAVID W. VINCENT
 JEFFREY W. VIROST
 ERIC J. VISGER
 BENJAMIN L. VISSER
 DAVID F. VITALE
 QUOC V. VO
 ROBERT S. VOGT
 WILLIAM D. VU
 SAMMY VUCKOVICH
 NOLAN L. VUJEVIC
 DUSTIN E. WADE
 ERIC FORREST WAGNER
 ERIC KENDRICK WAGNER
 DAMON A. WAGONER
 KYLE T. WAITE
 CLINT W. WAITKUS
 JAY C. WAKILD
 BRIAN MATTHEW WALBURN
 CHRISTOPHER J. WALKER
 JOHN M. WALKER
 JULIO CHRISTIAN WALKER

OWEN K. WALKER
 WILLIAM H. WALKER V
 MARK M. WALKUSKY
 JARED WALL
 REGINA K. WALL
 NATHANIEL P. WALLACE
 SHAUN R. WALLACE
 JAMES C. WALLISER
 GREGORY J. WALSH
 GREGORY R. WALSH
 JOSEPH M. WALTERS
 TRAVIS H. WALTERS
 LURIE L. WALTON, JR.
 CLAYTON WARD
 MICHAEL L. WARREN
 STEVEN M. WARRINGTON
 ADAM E. WASINGER
 DAVID M. WASSMUTH
 JEFFREY THOMAS WATERMAN
 ROBERT T. WATKINS
 DANIEL L. WAY
 CHRISTOPHER H. WEAVER
 JAY L. WEAVER
 MATTHEW W. WEAVER
 OESA A. WEAVER
 KANESHA A. WEBBER
 JAMES RICHARD WEBER
 KELLY R. WEBER
 ANDREW P. WEBSTER
 DANIEL R. WEBSTER
 PRESTON E. WEBSTER
 CURTIS EUGENE WEDDLE IV
 BENJAMIN ANTHONY WEDEKEMPER
 MARK A. WEEMS
 MATTHEW D. WEINMAN
 JENNIFER E. WELLER
 JONATHAN R. WELLMAN
 MICHAEL W. WELLS
 LARRY J. WENDT, JR.
 BENJAMIN J. WERNER
 WILLIAM H. WESTENDORF
 GABRIEL C. WETLESEN
 LISA R. WHALING
 PAUL R. WHITE
 JAKE D. WHITLOCK
 ROBERT J. WIBLE
 BLAIR T. WIGHT
 VANESSA C. WILCOX
 STEPHEN M. WILEY
 MICHAEL WILKES
 JORDAN P. WILKIE
 ANDREW C. WILKINS
 ANDREW B. WILLIAMS
 BRIAN E. WILLIAMS
 DEREK J. WILLIAMS
 JARED M. WILLIAMS
 JASON WILLIAMS
 JASON PATTON WILLIAMS
 JESSICA R. WILLIAMS
 JONATHAN S. WILLIAMS
 JOVON A. WILLIAMS
 VERONICA REYES WILLIAMS
 BRIAN L. WILLIS
 RYAN S. WILLIS
 ROBERT A. WILLLOUGHBY
 CARY W. WILSON
 JAMES A. WILSON IV
 JOHN W. WILSON
 ROBERT L. WILSON III
 CAROLYN L. WINN
 JOHN SCOTT WISECUP
 RICHARD N. WISEMAN
 BRANDEN M. WITTY
 BRIAN J. WITTHOEFT
 MATTHEW K. WOERTH II
 CASSANDRA L. WOJTASZEK
 GARTH W. WOLBER
 TRIGG R. WOLF
 ERIC M. WOLF
 SCOTT ALAN WOLVERTON
 CHRISTOPHER C. WONG
 WESLEY E. WOOD
 BLANCA C. WOODARD
 JASON M. WOODLEY
 MATTHEW G. WOODRUFF
 SHAMIKA N. WOODRUFF
 JOHN H. WOODS V
 DARREN C. WOODSIDE
 CHRISTOPHER L. WOOLARD
 BRIAN M. WOOLLEY
 ANDREW J. WORKMAN
 ANTHONY J. WRIGHT
 JASON RICHARD WRIGHT
 JOHN C. WRIGHT
 KEITH W. WRIGHT, JR.
 NICHOLAS F. WRIGHT
 STEVEN P. WRIGHT
 JACOB D. WYGANT
 JOSHUA M. WYGANT
 JASON E. WYMAN
 DANIEL C. WYNN
 PATRICK A. YANEZ
 JARED E. YANKECH
 DANIEL A. YAWN
 JEVON F. YERETZIAN
 JOHN CHANG WON YI
 YUE YI
 DAVID J. YOUD
 MATTHEW E. YOUMANS
 AARON B. YOUNG
 ADAM B. YOUNG
 PAIGE H. YOUNG
 RYAN E. YOUNG
 TYLER G. YOUNG
 TYLER J. YOUNG
 KEVIN M. YOUNGMEYER
 EMILY A. YTURRALDE

HARRY JOHN P. ZABALA
NATHAN J. ZAHN
NICOLE C. ZAYAS
CARRIE A. ZEDERKOF
MATTHEW J. ZEIGLER
DAVID C. ZESINGER
STEPHEN P. ZIEGENFUSS
BRADLEY R. ZIMMERMAN
MATTHEW P. ZIMMERMAN
MICHAEL S. ZINKGRAF
ADRIAN ALEXANDER ZINNERMAN
JOHN ZIRKLE
ELITHE E. ZOGLMAN
ADRIAN ARTHUR ZOLLINGER
JAROSLAW ZRODLOWSKI
TERRI L. ZUBER
MATHEW ZULAUF
CHRISTOPHER G. ZUMMO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

NICOLE H. ARMITAGE
DAWN B. BROOKS
MARY T. CARLISLE
KRISTIN L. CARLSON
ZINA M. CRUMP
BEATRICE T. DOLIHITE
SUSAN F. DUKES
KATHLEEN T. FOULK
PATRICIA I. JOHN
CHRISTINE A. KRESS
DEEANN M. LEES
LESTER P. LORETO
BRADLEY D. NIELSEN
JULIE R. OSTRAND
REGINA R. PADEN
JERRY D. RUMBACH
RICKY JAY SEXTON
MICHELE Y. SHELTON
MARCIA R. SMITH
PENNY E. SPAID
KATHERINE S. SPENCE
SHANNON G. WOMBLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JAMES D. BRANTINGHAM
JOSEPH DEICHERT
KENNETH A. REYES
G. LLOYD WOODBURY, JR.
GEORGE T. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

RANDALL E. ACKERMAN
JEFFREY D. ALEXANDER
ANDREW L. ALLEN
JACK E. ALLEN
JAYSON L. ALLEN
HEATHER J. ANDERSON
TODD W. ANDRE
WILLIAM S. ANGERMAN
STANLEY B. ARANT
DAVID M. ASHLEY
ISREAL L. ASKEW, JR.
ANTHONY D. BABCOCK
JASON E. BAILEY
DANIELLE L. BARNES
CATHERINE V. BARRINGTON
JASON E. BARTOLOMEI
JOHN T. BEATTIE
VICTOR W. BEELER
JASON H. BEERS
TREVOR B. BENITONE
DAVID W. BERG
TODD D. BERGMAN
WILLIAM D. BETTS
ROBERT L. BILLINGS
PAUL R. BIRCH
BENJAMIN W. BISHOP
JOHN C. BLACKWELL
RYAN D. BLAKE
DANIEL D. BLEVINS
THOMAS A. BONGIOVI
MATTHEW A. BOSCHERT
JOHN W. BOSONE
ERIK T. BOVASSO
JACQUELINE D. BREEDEN
AUGUSTIN P. BRIGUET
BERNARD C. BRINING
SCOTT W. BROOKS
THOMAS H. BROWN, JR.
COREY A. BRUNSON
DAVID W. BRYNTSON
GREG D. BUCKNER
TRAVIS A. BURDINE
DERREK P. BURRELL
WILLIAM C. BUSCHUR
CHRISTOPHER J. CALLIS
JOSEPH L. CAMPO
THOMAS L. CANTRELL
RITA C. CAREY
PATRICK J. CARLEY
RICHARD A. CARRELL
DAVID S. CHACE
JAMES W. CHAPPELEAR III
JOHN W. CHASTAIN III
TIMOTHY W. CHILDRESS
BRYAN J. CHOI

JOHN C. CHONG
SARAH J. CHRIST
JORDON T. COCHRAN
CHRISTOPHER L. COLCORD
TIMOTHY C. COLE
BRADFORD D. COLEY
RICHARD I. COLLINS
MICHAEL E. CONLEY
JASON W. COSTELLO
PEDRO A. COTTOPEREZ
YANCEY S. COWEN
ADRIAN M. CROWLEY
PATRICIA A. CSANK
CARY N. CULBERTSON
TIMOTHY M. CULLEN
MELISSA S. CUNNINGHAM
PATRICK C. DALEY
DANNY E. DAVIS
JAMES E. DAVIS
OSCAR DELGADO
MARK E. DELORY
DAVID W. DENGLER
BRIAN R. DENMAN
JOHN J. DERESKY
RICHARD R. DICKENS
MATTHEW E. DILLOW
JOSEPH M. DINGMAN
ANDREW S. DIPPOLITO
JEFFREY W. DONNITHORNE
TOBY G. DORAN
GARY J. DORMAN
SHANE A. DOUGHERTY
AARON D. DRAKE
DAVID R. DUNKLEE
JON A. EBERLAN
DOUGLAS C. EDWARDS
CHRISTOPHER L. ELLIS
JOSEPH A. ENGELBRECHT III
JEFFREY P. ENGELKER
ROBERT H. EPSTEIN
MICHAEL W. ERHARDT
MICHAEL S. ERICKSON
CHAD J. ESPAMER
JUPE A. ETHEBRIDGE
ROCKY A. FAVORITO
ANITA A. FEUGATE OPPERMAN
PAUL G. FILCEK
KARL C. FISCHBACH
ERICKA R. FLANIGAN
RICHARD L. FLETCHER
ARTHUR P. FORD IV
DAVID M. FRANKLIN
MARK S. FUHRMANN
DANE F. FULLER
JACK D. FULMER II
DANIEL C. FURLEIGH
FRANCISCO M. GALLEI
ANTHONY S. GAMBOA
ALEJANDRO R. GANSTER
SOLOMON M. GARRETT IV
CHRISTOPH T. GAUB
LEE G. GENITILE, JR.
JEFFREY T. GERAGHTY
ANGELA P. GIDDINGS
BRIDGET V. GIGLIOTTI
JASON N. GINGRICH
NICOLA P. GISMONDI
DAWN M. GITHENS
KENNETH D. GJONE
GREGORY J. GOAR
EDWARD G. GOEBEL, JR.
ROBERT J. GOMEZ
JOHN F. GONZALES
AENEAS R. GOODING
TIMOTHY A. GOODROE
ERIC C. GRACE
ROBERT S. GRAINGER
BRYAN C. GREEN
MICHAEL S. GREMILLION
STEPHEN C. GROTHORN
SCOTT A. GROVER
JOHN M. GROVES
MATTHEW S. GUENTHER
AARON GUILF
DANIEL A. GULINAN
GARRY A. HAASE
TYLER N. HAGUE
DEDE S. HALPHILL
JAMES C. HALL
MICHELLE L. HALL
LOUIS W. HANSEN
DAVID G. HANSON
CRAIG M. HARMON
MICHAEL J. HARNER
SHAUN D. HARRADEN
GLENN T. HARRIS
LARRY R. HARRIS
BRIAN S. HARTLESS
SHANE C. HAUGHIAN
GARY T. HAYWARD
TREVOR D. HAZEN
KEVIN D. HECKLE
TIMOTHY J. HEINTZELMAN
ROBERT L. HENDERSON
SHANE M. HENDERSON
TAMARA J. HENDERSON
TROY C. HENDERSON
BRIAN A. HENSON
DALE E. HETKE
SCOTT G. HEYLER
TRAVIS J. HILL
DAVID L. HILLMAN
BRIAN A. HINSVARK
LANCE A. HOBSON
GEORGE A. HOLLAND III
SLOAN L. HOLLIS
RYAN D. HOLLMAN

ERIC W. HOOK
TODD M. HOOVER
ROBERT A. HOSKINS
JAMES C. HOWARD
FREDERICK A. HUNT, JR.
SCOTT W. HURRELBRINK
DALE E. HYBL
MICHAEL D. INGERSOLL
ZIGMUND W. JACKIM
BRIAN A. JACKSON
ROBERT D. JACKSON
MATTHEW P. JEFSON
GARY S. JOHNSON
MATTHEW C. JOHNSON
STEPHAN K. JOHNSON
KENNETH M. JONES
MICHAEL C. JONES
SEAN S. JONES
KEVIN G. JUDD
CRAIG E. JUNEAU
HAROLD M. KAHLER
EDWARD A. KAPLAN
MITCHELL A. KATOSIC
DEE J. KATZER
RYAN P. KEENEY
BRIAN T. KEHL
JOSEPH P. KENDALL
PAUL D. KIRMIS
JOHN T. KNACK
ERIC W. KNAPP
DANIEL J. KNIGHT
JASON L. KNIGHT
MONTI L. KNODE
RICHARD T. KOCH
TROY D. KOEPNICK
JEREMY D. KOKENES
PAUL KOPECKI
NICHOLAS T. KOZDRAS
TIMOTHY A. KRAUSS
JEFFREY T. KRONWITZER
JASON B. LAMB
RICHARD L. LAND III
SHAWN D. LANCHESTER
STAN D. LAWRIE
JOHN W. LECLAIR, JR.
CHRISTOPHER D. LEMANSKI
DANIEL W. LEMON
BRIAN D. LEWIS
GARRY M. LITTLE
JAMES E. LONG
CRAIG R. LUCEY
DAVID C. LYONS
CHRISTOPHER A. MACAULAY
BRETT J. MACHOVINA
DEBORAH L. MACKAY
CURTIS J. MADELEY
NICOLE M. E. MALLEY
MICHAEL E. MALLEY
MICHAEL T. MANOR
DANIEL J. MARKEM
WILLIAM L. MARSHALL
JEFFREY S. MARTIN
JOHN R. MARTIN
FERNANDO MARTINEZ
WILLIAM G. MAXWELL
PAUL J. MAYKISH
BRADLEY M. MCPALPINE
SHAWN B. MCCAMISH
CRAIG A. MCCARTY
MATTHEW S. MCCONNELL
CHARLES A. MCELVAINE
SEAN A. MCKAY
RICHARD A. MCKEE
SEAN C. MCLAY
JEFFREY S. MCLEMORE
ROBERT J. MCMURRY
JOHN S. MEITZER
JEFFREY T. MENASCO
KURT A. MENCKE
DAMON L. MENENDEZ
JEFFREY A. MERCHANT
CARLOS R. MESSER, JR.
AARON J. MEYERS
MICHAEL T. MILES
GREGORY J. MILLER
MICHAEL S. MILLER
PATRICK G. MILLER
THOMAS G. MINER, JR.
ALEXANDER MIRAVITE, JR.
LAWRENCE W. MITCHELL
MARK L. MITCHEM
JAMES C. MOCK
ROBERT G. MOOSE
GREGORY M. MOSELEY
TIMOTHY J. MOSER
JAMES V. MOTT
MICHAEL W. MOYLES
ANDREW J. MUSER
HENRY MYERS, JR.
JOSEPH E. NANCE
JEFFREY W. NELSON
JESSICA D. NICHOL
RODNEY H. NICKOLS
DAWN A. NICKELL
KRISTOPHER T. NORWOOD
GREGORY E. NOWAK
CHRISTOPHER P. NUTTING
THOMAS J. O'CONNELL, JR.
DONALD R. OHLEMACHER
DAVID W. OLANDER
DEREK J. OMALLEY
TRACY L. ONUFER
MARK D. OREILLY
CHRISTOPHER J. OUELLETTE
JOHN P. PANTLEO
ROBERT L. PATA
JASON PATLA

WILLIAM T. PATRICK
JEFFERY S. PATTON
MAX E. PEARSON
PAUL E. PENDLETON
JOHN C. PETERSON
IAN D. PHILLIPS
WILLIAM M. C. PHILLIPS
SHANE T. PRATER
KERRY J. PROULX
JEFFREY A. PRUSS
MICHELS D. PRYOR
RILEY F. PYLES
HUGH M. RAGLAND III
BRIAN E. RALSTON
ROBERT G. RAMIREZ
COREY M. RAMSBY
DANIEL E. RAUCH
CLIFTON D. REED
BOB A. REEVES
JAY B. REEVES
LAURA A. REGAN
MARK D. REIMANN
ROBERT S. RENFRO II
ANTHONY G. RETKA
DOUGLAS P. RICE
LAURIE K. RICHTER
MICHAEL G. RIDER
SUSAN M. RIORDANSMITH
FRANCISCO RIVERA
TODD A. ROBBINS
CHARLES P. ROBERTS
ANGENENE L. ROBERTSON
SEAN W. ROBERTSON
QUENTON L. RODGERS
STEVEN M. ROSS
SCOTT A. ROTH
SCOTT A. ROTHERMEL
PAUL C. ROUNSAVALL
SEAN C. ROUTIER
ROBERT D. ROY
JASON M. RUESCHHOFF
TIMOTHY R. RYAN
DEREK M. SALMI
MARC J. SANDS
ANTHONY J. SANSANO
LANCE E. SCHMIDT
KARL R. SCHRADER
CHAD W. SCHRECKENGOST
TODD S. SCHUG
THOMAS W. SEEKER
HARRY L. SEIBERT, JR.
BRETT S. SEILING
JOHN D. SEUELL
GLEN R. SHILLAND
THOMAS C. SHRUM
MICHAEL J. SIERCO
SANJIT SINGH
TIMOTHY A. SITES
PATRICK M. SKENDZIEL
JOHN P. SMALL
BRADLEY K. SMITH
DOUGLAS D. SMITH
GARY T. SMITH
JAMES E. SMITH
MICHAEL S. SMITH
PAUL P. SMITH, JR.
STEPHEN P. SNELSON
MARK K. SNOW
MARK SOTALLARO
ERIC J. SOTO
BRADLEY L. SPEARS
YVONNE S. SPENCER
KIRK N. STAHLBAUM
DAVID L. STANFIELD
DEVIN STATHAM
RICHARD V. STEELE
DAVID E. STONE
TODD R. STRATTON
ANTHONY C. STROUP
JOSE E. SUMANGIL
DUSTIN G. SUTTON
ROBERT A. SYLVESTER
DREW R. TAYLOR
MARY R. TEETER
MERRYL TENGESDAL
ALLEN L. THIBEAUX
JEREMY L. THIEL
ROBERT S. THOMPSON
SHAWN C. THOMPSON
ROBERT T. TIBBETTS
DAYMEN L. TIFFANY
VASAGA TILO, JR.
KIMBERLY A. TOOMAN
WILLIAM D. TRAUTMANN
JACOB TRIGLER
JOHN E. TRYON
KELLY C. TUCKER
TEERA TONY TUNYAVONGS
WALLACE R. TURNBULL III
UDUAK I. UDOAKA
KENNETH R. UHLER
DAVID M. VACLAVIK
DENNIS R. VEENEMAN
JOSEPH L. VEIT
MATTHEW C. VILLELLA
JOHN C. VINCENT
KEVIN P. WADE

KEVIN P. WALKER
KARILYNN WALLACE
DEMETRIUS WALTERS
JENIFER B. E. WARREN
TRACY R. WATKINS
MICHAEL T. WEAVER
SAMANTHA WEEKS
HEWETT S. WELLS
JOSEPH H. WENCKUS
KURT A. WENDT
TREVOR A. WENTLANDT
SCOTT A. WESTON
PATRICK J. WHITE
LANCE D. WHITFILL
DOUGLAS P. WICKERT
LANCE A. WILKINS
DONALD S. WILSON
JAMES S. WILSON
REGINA S. WINCHESTER
JOHN W. WINKLER
THOMAS Q. WOFFORD
GREGORY R. WOOD
JONATHAN L. WRIGHT
MICHAEL A. WULFESTIEG
DONN C. YATES
SANG H. YOO
JOHN P. ZAPATA
ZACHARY B. ZEINER
DEAN E. ZEZEUS
JAMES J. ZIRKEL
STEVEN M. ZUBOWICZ
MICHAEL J. ZUHLSDORF
CLINTON R. ZUMBRUNNEN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

THOMAS M. CHEREPKO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

RODNEY E. GARFIELD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MARK A. ENDSLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JACOB A. JOHNSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

PATRICK MASCARENHAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

DEBRA MAYERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ENLISTED MEMBER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

DWAIPAYAN CHAKRABORTI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ERIC B. HINTZ
DANIEL R. KLINGER
RORY J. PETTEYS
BART D. WILKISON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

KATHRYN A. SPLETOSER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER-MINISTER:
JUDY R. REINKE, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED:

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION INTO AND WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

BRIAN C. BRISSON, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL L. MCGEE, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW P. WYLEGALA, OF WASHINGTON

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

SANDILLO N. BANERJEE, OF VIRGINIA
MITCHELL GREGORY LARSEN, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID MCNEILL, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER R. QUINLIVAN, OF WASHINGTON
CAMERON S. WERKER, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BARBARA FARRAR, OF VIRGINIA
EVERETT G. WAKAL, OF CALIFORNIA
JANELLE WEYEK, OF WISCONSIN

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

TIMOTHY C. CANNON, OF COLORADO
BRIDGETTE CLARK, OF ALABAMA
JOSHUA HALPERN, OF NEW YORK
DOUGLAS JACOBSON, OF MINNESOTA
YOUQING MA, OF OREGON
DEAN R. MATLACK, OF MINNESOTA
JOEL REYNOSO, OF NEW YORK
REBECCA TORRES, OF FLORIDA
TERRI TYMINSKI, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KAREN ALLEN, OF ARIZONA
KAREN BALLARD, OF IDAHO
BRITTANY BANTA, OF NEW YORK
SAMUEL L. BATEMAN, OF COLORADO
MICHAEL A. CALVERT, OF WASHINGTON
JULIE ANN CARDUCCI, OF ILLINOIS
WELLINGTON CHU, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CAROLINE CHUNG, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES PRESTON CURTIS, OF MINNESOTA
LANCE B. ENCE, OF VIRGINIA
SHAKIR Y. FARSAKH, OF NEW YORK
PAUL FROST, OF TEXAS
JEFFREY ALLEN GEIGER, OF VIRGINIA
TYLER GRANT HACKING, OF WISCONSIN
MINDI B. HERTZOG, OF FLORIDA
DAVID B. KINCAID, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERICK V. KISH, OF WASHINGTON
DANIEL SUNG-DOK LEW, OF CALIFORNIA
ARLENE MASUE MAYEDA, OF VIRGINIA
MELISSA MCINNIS, OF COLORADO
THOMAS J. MEADE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ALLISON HILLARY MELLO, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL A. MIDDLETON, OF VERMONT
RANDOLPH T. MOORE, OF VIRGINIA
TAMARIND E. MURRIETTA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL K. MUTH, OF FLORIDA
GEOFFREY PARISH, OF TEXAS
CHARLES M. PHILLIPS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NEIL PAUL PICKETT, OF ILLINOIS
MATTHEW POOLE, OF ILLINOIS
GARY F. RAND II, OF MARYLAND
RHONDA M. SINKFIELD, OF GEORGIA
MICHELE RENEE SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
KENNIA J. SOMERVILLE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JONATHAN T. WARD, OF WASHINGTON
CATHERINE M. WERNER, OF PENNSYLVANIA

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on March 4, 2015 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

GILBERTO DE JESUS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE WINSLOW LORENZO SARGEANT, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 8, 2015.