

RECOGNIZING THE ROLES AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE TEACHERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 175, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 175) recognizing the roles and contributions of the teachers of the United States to building and enhancing the civic, cultural, and economic well-being of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 175) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 11, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 11; 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 any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators should expect a vote in relation to S. Con. Res. 16, at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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, following the remarks of Senators COTTON and CARPER.

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

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT L. HITE

Mr. COTTON. Fellow Members, today I recognize a distinguished American hero, Lieutenant Colonel Robert Hite of Camden, AK, who died last month at the age of 95.

Just months after the attack on Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941, a group of courageous young pilots flew Army Air Forces bombers off the deck of the USS Hornet in the Pacific Ocean to carry out a dangerous, low-altitude bombing attack on Japan's home islands. The Doolittle Raid provided an enormous morale boost for Americans with a crushing blow to the imperial regime in Tokyo.

Among these brave men was an Arkansan, Colonel Robert L. Hite. Colonel Hite had enlisted as an aviation cadet on September 9, 1940. He was later commissioned as a second lieutenant and rated as a pilot on May 29, 1941. Almost bumped from the mission because of space limitations, Colonel Hite was assigned as a copilot ultimately to the B-25 "Bat Out of Hell." He rejected his fellow airmen's attempts to buy his spot on the plane and launched his mission on April 19, 1942.

Lieutenant Colonel Hite's aircraft successfully carried out a low-level bombing run on an aircraft factory and fuel depot in Nagoya, Japan, but inclement weather forced the crew to bail out over Japanese-controlled territory as their plane ran low on fuel. Lieutenant Colonel Hite landed in a Japanese rice paddy field, where he was captured and sentenced to execution.

Lieutenant Colonel Hite served 40 months in a Japanese prison—38 of them in solitary confinement—where he was tortured and endured brutal conditions. Following V-J Day, Lieutenant Colonel Hite was freed on August 20, 1945. He returned home and married his first wife Portia 1 year later.

Lieutenant Colonel Hite later returned to active service, training pilots overseas during the Korean war from 1951 to 1955. After leaving Active Duty, he and Portia moved home to Camden, AR, where he managed the Camden Hotel until 1965.

Lieutenant Colonel Hite was widowed in 1999 and later married his late wife, Dorothy.

Lieutenant Colonel Hite is survived by two children, five grandchildren, seven great-grandchildren, and two great-great-grandchildren.

On April 18, just 2 weeks after his death, and the 73rd anniversary of the Doolittle Raid, Lieutenant Colonel Hite and his fellow soldiers were posthumously awarded the Congressional Gold Medal of Honor.

Arkansans young and old and all Americans can appreciate Lieutenant Colonel Hite's service to his family, his community, and his Nation—a fine example for us all to emulate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I see my colleague, the Senator from Delaware. I know he asked for time. I didn't ask for time set aside for myself.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate Senator CARPER, and I know he asked for time, so I will yield for his remarks.

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

TRIBUTE TO ADAM SCHILDGE AND MIA BEERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. I thank my colleague for his graciousness. I told him I would speak for 10 minutes. It is usually about 10 hours, but I only have 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I rise today on the Senate floor to recognize the efforts of many of our Nation's public servants. Since 1985, the very first week of May has been dedicated to highlighting the millions of hard-working Americans who serve our Nation as Federal employees, State employees, county and local government employees, and members of the uniformed services, which I have been privileged to be one for some 23 years.

This week marks the 30th annual Public Service Recognition Week and serves as an important opportunity for those here in the Senate to show our appreciation for their dedication and service to our community and to our Nation.

Throughout my time in public office, including during my time on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, which I have been a member of now for about 14 years and which I chaired for the last 2 years, I have had the great pleasure of meeting with any number of dedicated and accomplished public servants. In talking with them, I have been able to learn more about their work, more about their families, learn more about their commitment to public service that they share with all of us.

Today, I would like to take a couple minutes to highlight the outstanding service of some of our public servants across our Federal Government. In these cases, their extraordinary service has directly impacted the lives of the

Americans they serve. In fact, the two individuals I plan to highlight today are finalists for something called the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals that are awarded by the Partnership for Public Service each year.

As you may know, on October 29, 2012—at least we know in Delaware, New Jersey, and New York—Superstorm Sandy made landfall in the United States. Its impact up and down the east coast was, in a word, devastating. In another word, it was heart-breaking. New York, New Jersey, and parts of New England were hit particularly hard. My home State of Delaware was hit hard, too. Widespread flooding caused severe damage to many homes and businesses. Our transportation infrastructure suffered, too. Roads and bridges were damaged or washed out, hurting commerce and transportation and cutting off access to hospitals, schools, and work.

What we learned through the difficult recovery that followed is that sound and effective mitigation policies should be thoroughly calculated into any recovery effort. Through mitigation, we can get better results, save money, and save lives.

Following Superstorm Sandy, Congress passed an almost \$11 billion special transportation appropriations bill. A large portion of that funding—roughly one-third of it, \$3.6 billion—was to be used for something called resilience grants dedicated to protecting the infrastructure repaired after Sandy.

A fellow named Adam Schildge—Adam Schildge—senior program analyst at the Federal Transit Administration in Washington, DC, was a key player in developing, implementing, and managing a competitive grant program to distribute those \$3.6 billion in resilience funds. Those grants, once awarded, supported construction projects that will reduce the cost to taxpayers in cleaning up after future storms. They will also reduce the number of lives and properties lost from powerful natural disasters.

As you can imagine, the task assigned to him—here is Adam right here, Adam Schildge—the task assigned to Adam was not an easy one. His mission was critical. His mission, basically, was to identify projects that, if funded, would get better results, save money, and save lives. In order to determine what projects should receive funding, Adam meticulously combed through grant application after grant application to assess the resilience of planned infrastructure projects.

When I think of “resilience,” I think about how we save money in the future in the event that we have a storm of that nature again. And, believe me, we will. Because of Adam’s painstaking attention to detail, eye for innovation, and his dedication to the lives at stake during future storms, Adam was able to grant funding to transportation projects that will serve all Americans for generations to come and to endure the forces of extreme weather.

According to Adam, he took the position in public service because it was—these are his words—“the greatest opportunity to impact communities.” He went on to say: “I’ve always known I wanted to work for the public good and I’ve found a good way now to give back to communities across the country.” Those are his words.

Our Nation’s public servants are making a difference across the globe too.

As the Presiding Officer may remember, less than a year ago, a deadly epidemic of the Ebola virus gripped Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea, and Mali. The severity and scale of the outbreak was an unprecedented challenge to the worldwide public health community. The rapid spread of the outbreak reminded us that deadly and infectious diseases know no borders.

It also sent us an important reminder to remember the parable of the Good Samaritan, that we should love our neighbors as ourselves. JEFF, my friend, Senator SESSIONS over here, knows the Bible pretty well. He recalls in the New Testament where some of the pharisees are trying to trick Jesus. They asked him a question. They said: What is the greatest commandment of all?

Jesus responded: It is not just one; there are two. The first is to love the Lord thy God with all our heart, all our soul, all our mind. And then he said: The second great commandment is to love thy neighbor as thyself.

The pharisees said: Well, who is our neighbor? He told them the parable of the Good Samaritan. That is where we come up with that. But in the spirit of the Good Samaritan—and the story goes back a couple of thousand years—thousands of public servants were dispatched to battle Ebola at its epicenter, on the ground in Africa.

A woman named Mia Beers—there she is. Mia Beers was one of those courageous public servants. As the Director of the Humanitarian Policy and Global Engagement Division at the U.S. Agency for International Development, Mia led the U.S. Ebola Disaster Assistance Response Team into the epicenter of the epidemic in Monrovia, Liberia.

On the ground, Mia synchronized the efforts of thousands of public health and emergency response workers across five different Federal agencies. Under her leadership, the response team offered training support and contact tracing to better protect health workers in close contact with this deadly disease.

She also worked closely with the State Department to strategize response efforts in real time, including ways to inform vulnerable populations about the disease as quickly and efficiently as possible.

According to Mia’s colleagues, her robust leadership and coordination helped to steer the worldwide response out of the crisis mode and to stem the tide of the deadly global outbreak. Ac-

ording to Mia, it was all because of—these are her words—“the dedication and passion and knowledge” of the people who she worked with.

Not long ago I was with Department of Homeland Security Deputy Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, meeting with some Department of Homeland Security employees at a roundtable. The roundtable was focused on employees and improving the employee morale. During that meeting, he reiterated the profound impact that each employee has on his or her agency and the mission. All told—Ali Mayorkas told the story of an employee at NASA headquarters who was working late one night into the morning hours. The employee finally gathered himself to leave, and he came across a custodian mopping the floors. He asked the employee: What do you do?

The custodian who was mopping the floors replied: I am putting a man on the moon.

Think about that. I am putting a man on the moon. Every day that custodian went to work thinking he was part of an important mission. The same is true for employees across the Federal Government in its various agencies. These dedicated and hard-working public servants are just two among the hundreds of thousands who are making a difference in the lives of their fellow Americans every day.

I want to encourage us all to visit a Web site that is called the Partnership for Public Service to learn more stories about some outstanding public servants and public employees. Today and every day, I want to thank these employees—we ought to thank these employees—for their service, their humble service, their selfless service to our Nation. I hope they all know how important their work is—everything you do in this work across our country and around the world and that you know what brings joy to you.

Let me close with this, if I could. I say through the Presiding Officer to my friend Senator SESSIONS: I was reading earlier this week in the newsclips that come to me from my staff—I was reading the results of an interview, I think, from interviews with maybe 1,500 very senior-level Federal employees. They were basically being asked: How do you like your job? A lot of them, frankly, reported they did not have the sense of satisfaction that they really had hoped for and expected they would have.

They were asked: If something could change that would make you feel better about the work you do and people’s appreciation of the work you do, what would help the most?

The first question they asked them was this: How about more pay? How about more of this or more of that? Believe it or not, what most of them said they would like to have more of was just to be thanked. For somebody to say: The work that you do is important. We are grateful as a nation that you do this.

That is something all of us can do. I had a conversation here on the floor, I say to Senator SESSIONS, with JIM INHOFE, our colleague from Oklahoma. He talked about the TSA employees. When he flies home, back to Oklahoma, and flies out of here, either through Reagan—probably Reagan and on to Dallas and to Tulsa. He has gotten to know the TSA employees there. I think he makes a habit of thanking them for the work they do for all of us.

I try to do the same sort of thing when I travel around the country. I bump into Coast Guard folks or other people, especially those who are associated with the Department of Homeland Security. It is an easy thing to do, just say thank you for the work they do on behalf of all of us—especially if we tell them who we are. They will appreciate it, and it will make a difference in their lives, and maybe even a difference in their performance going forward. Thank you so much. God bless.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we have a lot of good people in the Senate, and Senator CARPER is one of the best. He does, indeed, live by the Golden Rule, and it is an inspiration to us—as I have told him more than once—when we have had hot debate in the Senate. He always keeps his good nature, his loving spirit, and always sets a good example.

I say thank you to Senator CARPER. It is appropriate to thank Federal employees for their work. Not counting the Army Reserve time, I have quite a few years myself in Federal service and love the people I have had the honor to work with.

I ask that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

#### TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we will be dealing soon—I guess next week—with trade promotion authority and the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement, the TPP. Conventional wisdom is that trade agreements are good. We should just move them forward. Let's have an expedited fast-track process—a fast-track agreement with the TPA—and we will get this done and it is going to work out well for the American people.

But in truth, I have to say, since I voted for every trade agreement, one virtually every year since I have been here—except one—the data doesn't give us much confidence that a loosely drawn or improperly drawn agreement is going to help us. In fact, evidence indicates it is not helping us. It is not helping the economy of the United States. It is not helping growth. Some of these agreements have clearly exacerbated our trade deficit.

So it is a remarkable thing, and we want to believe in trade, and I do, but the United States has interests, our

trading partners have interests, and our trading partners are far more mercantile, far more focused on increasing exports to foreign countries—to the biggest market in the world, the United States—and far more focused on blocking imports that would compete against locally manufactured products than the United States has been producing.

Some say: Well, that is not a problem. The United States is smarter in the long run. But I would say I am looking at this more carefully now.

I voted for the Korea agreement. Our Korean allies are good people. It is a great country. They achieved so much after the Korean war, and we are proud of them. We have many positive relationships and a fabulous Hyundai plant in my State. It hires thousands, and they have suppliers that add thousands of jobs also.

What about that agreement? I supported it. I thought it was a good agreement. It passed here by a substantial vote. But when you look at it, it didn't work out as well as people said.

The U.S. Federal Trade Commission—our own trade commission—estimated that the reduction of Korean tariffs against our exports to Korea and tariff rate quotas on goods alone would have added at least \$10 billion to annual exports to Korea. That is \$10 billion. Well, last year, three years after the agreement was passed, we didn't export \$10 billion; we exported less than \$1 billion to Korea—\$0.8 billion. So that is a very huge difference, while at the same time Korea's imports to the United States have surged and the trade deficit the United States had with Korea, which was already large, has almost doubled in that time.

So I appreciate the complexity of the issue and want to talk about it.

As we wrestle with how we continue with this situation with the TPP, trade promotion authority, I ask my colleagues about some of the questions we ought to consider. I know there is a goal to move this thing forward fast rather than slow. The faster we get it done, the fewer questions that get asked, and we have fewer problems. But that is not our problem. That is not our duty.

I wrote President Obama a letter yesterday. I made some comments and asked some questions that I believe are reasonable and fair questions to ask before we vote on this agreement that he has been negotiating but that, of course, hasn't completed the negotiations on. And, to the extent to which it has been reduced to writing, which is only partial, it is locked up in secret, and we are able to view it only privately. We are not allowed to quote it or copy it to let the public know what is in it.

I asked him:

You have asked Congress to approve fast-track legislation (Trade Promotion Authority) that would allow international trade and regulatory agreements to be expedited through Congress for the next six years with-

out amendment. Fast-track, which proponents hope to adopt within days, would also ensure that these agreements—none of which have yet been made public—could pass with a simple majority vote, rather than the 67 votes applied to treaties or the 60 votes applied to important legislative matters.

This is one of the largest international compacts in the history of the United States. [It amounts to 40 percent of global GDP.] Yet, this agreement will be kept a closely-guarded secret until after Congress agrees to yield its institutional powers and provide the administration with a guaranteed "fast-track" to adoption.

In other words, we are going to agree in advance, before we see the completed deal, before it is made public, to allow this agreement to pass into effect without the ability to have any amendment to it or to fully understand it.

I think that is a big ask of Congress. It has always been problematic to use this fast-track procedure. I have voted for trade agreements which were fast-tracked, I acknowledge, in the past, and maybe they have helped us some.

But I do believe it is time for us to be a lot more careful today with the trade agreements that we sign and ask a lot more rigorously what impact it will have on working Americans, not just some capital group in the canyons of Wall Street.

So I continued to write:

The U.S. ran a record \$51.4 billion trade deficit in March.

That is a record first quarter, I believe. It was a six-year record this year for the trade deficit. That means the amount we export is vastly exceeded by the amount we import—\$51.4 billion.

Economists tell us—and I don't think there is any dispute—that when you are evaluating trade growth you have to subtract trade deficits since they are a negative to growth. So our trade deficits are pulling down growth in America. They are pulling down job creation. They are pulling down wage growth. They are pulling down our economy.

I continue to quote:

This is especially concerning since, in 2011, assurances were made from the Administration that the recent South Korea free trade deal would "increase exports of American goods by \$10 billion to \$11 billion." But, in fact, American domestic exports to Korea increased by only \$0.8 billion, an increase of 1.8 percent, while imports from Korea increased \$12.6 billion, an increase of 22.5 percent.

So, in other words, imports from Korea to the United States increased \$12.6 billion. Our exports to them increased less than \$1 billion.

Continuing:

Our trade deficit with Korea increased \$11.8 billion between 2011 and 2014, an increase of 80.4 percent, nearly doubling in the three years since the deal was ratified.

And we were promised the other. We were promised it would enhance, dramatically, exports. I continue:

Overall, we have already lost more than 2.1 million manufacturing jobs to the Asian Pacific region since 2001.

Look, we know there are wage advantages in Asia, but wages are going up