Army in World War I and was awarded the Silver Star. His father served in the Army in World War II. William had three brothers: Paul, Jim, and John. William's brothers remember him as a dedicated marine who gave his life for a cause in which he strongly believed. They cherish the memories and the stories they keep in their hearts today about their brother.

GILBERT ''GIL'' BARGMANN

Gil Bargmann was born July 26, 1950. He grew up in Hannover, served in the Army, 4th Battalion, 9th Infantry Regiment. He died on June 19, 1969, at the age of 18.

Gil had three brothers and two sisters. He grew up on a dairy farm in the Hannover area. One of his squad brothers credits Gil for saving his life by covering his flank the day Gil died.

Gil's niece, Briana, connected three men who served with Gil in Vietnam with Gil's family. Three of Gil's friends and two of their wives traveled to Hannover to meet Gil's mother and siblings.

I am struck as I go through these names and as I review all of the people, and I am struck, sitting by children who are maybe just 2 years younger than these brave men who served our country. I know it is impossible to predict what amazing things they would have done had they not sacrificed their lives. So it is so important that we recognize their heroism, that we recognize their sacrifice, and that we honor them during this period of recognition of the sacrifices of the Vietnam war.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ATF PROPOSAL ON M855 AMMUNITION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, in my home State of Kansas, we enjoy a special way of life. I have talked about it many times on the Senate floor. That special way of life includes a rich tradition of hunting, target shooting, and other law-abiding activities covered by our Second Amendment rights. Our State welcomes nearly 300,000 hunters each year, and in turn those individuals create jobs and economic opportunity for many Kansans.

I was disturbed to learn of a recent proposal by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. On Friday, February 13, the ATF proposed—without any instruction from Congress, on its own volition—a framework to determine whether M855 ammunition, which is popular for hunting and target shooting, is primarily intended to be used for sporting or if it is more likely to be used in handguns by criminals. ATF indicated it wants to ban the ammunition, which has been used by law-abiding citizens, including Kansans, for decades because it is ''armor piercing'' and, therefore, poses a risk to the safety of law enforcement officials.

The fact is that almost all rifle ammunition is armor-piercing. The Law Enforcement Protection Act of 1986, which ATF cites as a statutory authority to ban this ammunition, specifically exempts armor-piercing ammunition ''which the Attorney General finds is primarily intended to be used for sporting purposes.'' Congress's intent for providing this exemption was clear: Law-abiding citizens should not be deprived of their right to use this ammo for legitimate purposes, such as target shooting, hunting, and shooting competitions. In fact, Kansans, who expressed their concern to me about this issue in recent weeks, have consistently indicated that the proposed ban would directly interfere with their sporting uses and, more broadly, their Second Amendment rights.

Most troubling about the ATF proposal was how it intended to judge ''likely use'' of this ammunition. ATF planned to judge that M855 ammunition is more likely to be used in a handgun for criminal purposes rather than for sporting purposes simply based upon the bullet's weight and type of firearm in which it could be loaded. What was missing was any interest by ATF in the law-abiding ammunition consumers across the county. How might they use the ammunition? How could ATF determine primary intended use without conducting a study on how that ammunition actually would be used by the public?

The ATF framework failed to make any objective conclusions and would have served as nothing more than a tool for increased gun restrictions—and I would say increased gun restrictions that weren't passed by Congress.

Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee chairman, Senator GRASSLEY, circulated a letter among my colleagues and to me directed at ATF Director B. Todd Jones outlining these and many other concerns related to the proposed framework to ban this ammunition. I join Senator GRASSLEY in signing this letter, and I am thankful it appears that our message was received because on Tuesday of this week the ATF announced that it will ''formally delay'' the implementation of the proposed ammunition ban. I thank the thousands—in fact, tens of thousands of Americans who voiced their concerns both to Congress and to ATF. ATF received an incredible 80,000 public comments on the proposed framework.

Congress has never banned this ammunition and has never intended to ban it. In the future, the ATF should not propose to ban any widely used form of ammunition favored by law-abiding civilians for lawful purposes.

Again, I am thankful that the proposed framework has now been rescinded, and I will continue my efforts in the Senate to support the Second Amendment freedoms of all Americans.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate the good work of the Senator from Kansas. We have worked on, in the Banking Committee, a number of issues together, and I appreciate the work we have been able to do across party lines. So I thank the Senator for that.

TRADE TRANSPARENCY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I am joined on the floor this evening by Senator CASEY. Just 2 weeks ago, he and I and a half dozen other Senators came to the floor in an unusual configuration. It is not something Senators do all that often. We came as a group, but each spoke individually about our concerns with trade promotion authority and the Trans-Pacific Partnership, both the so-called fast track and the trade agreement that is being negotiated among the United States, Canada, Mexico, some Pacific nations, and Peru, I believe, too, as well as nations in Asia.

The concerns we have and the concerns an increasing number of Senators have about trade promotion authority, about fast track—they changed the name because they knew the public did not like fast track, so they tried to obscure it by coming up with some technical-sounding name—trade promotion authority. We have increasingly seen the public rising up against these trade agreements because we have watched them for some 20 years, and we have seen the damage the North American Free Trade Agreement did to the United States, to our economy, and to workers around the world. We have seen that has been sort of a prototype for the next generation of CAFTA and other agreements in Colombia and Peru and now the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I want to discuss this, in part, because we know so little about the U.S. Trade Representative's upcoming trade agenda and specifically the Trans-Pacific Partnership. The way we pass trade agreements, and it is important for colleagues to understand this, stands in a class by itself. No other legislation we do is as hidden not only from public view but even those in this body whose constitutional duty it is to approve or reject them.

Senator CASEY and I stood here in the well of the Senate, we raised our right hands—Senator CASEY and I were honored to come in at the same time, as of January 2007 and then again in January 2013. We raised our right hands and took an oath understanding our constitutional duty to approve or reject trade agreements.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution entrusts in Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations, but the current TPP language is