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

**PRAYER**

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

Let us pray.

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

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

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

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

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

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

**IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today we will begin consideration of the resolution to disapprove the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action negotiated by China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United King-
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the President’s deal with Iran will allow it to further ballistic missile research and strengthen its economy. In short, by almost any measure, we know Iran will emerge stronger from this deal in nearly every aspect of its national power and better positioned to expand its sphere of influence.

The Iranian nuclear program was never intended to produce nuclear energy for peaceful civilian purposes. That was never what they had in mind. Certainly Iran does not need an underground enrichment facility for those purposes or long-range ballistic missiles. Iran has employed every aspect of national power to defend the regime and the Islamic revolution to include support for terrorism, unconventional warfare, public diplomacy, cyber warfare, suppression of internal dissent, and, of course, support for proxies and terrorist groups. We already know Iran is undertaking many activities relevant to the development of a nuclear explosive device. As the International Atomic Energy Agency revealed in a November 2011 report, it has attempted to, No. 1, procure nuclear-related equipment and materials through individuals and entities related to the military; No. 2, develop pathways for the production of nuclear material; No. 3, acquire nuclear weapons development information and documentation from a clandestine nuclear supply network; and No. 4, develop an indigenous design of a nuclear weapon, as well as test components. All of that has been done, according to the IAEA.

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

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

They warned:

Iranian or Iranian client forces are now the pre-eminent military or political element in multiple Arab countries. Unless political restraint is linked to nuclear restraint, an agreement achieving these objectives will also provide Iran with the capability to expand and entrench its power in neighboring states.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

WELCOMING EVERYONE BACK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I want everyone here to know everyone back from our long recess. I am sure everyone worked as hard as I did. I had a week off, and I enjoyed it very much. I also think it is important to recognize the new class of pages we have. I am always very happy to see these bright young men and women here who will devote the rest of the semester to us. They do so much and get so little recognition for it, so I appreciate all they do for us.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I gave a speech this morning at Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and it is, I think, directly how I feel about this. I am glad it got some coverage. I ask unanimous consent that the full remarks of the speech I made this morning at 10 o’clock be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH

Mr. REID. Remarks on Iran Nuclear Agreement, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C.  

When the Senate is gathered into session a few hours from now, a debate that has ignited passions from Tehran to Tel Aviv, from Beijing to Berlin, and from coast to coast across the United States will take center stage in the world’s greatest deliberative body. The question at hand is no small matter: Is the agreement between Iran and the international community, the United States, the largest power in the world, and our partners and interests?

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

While the formal debate begins this afternoon, the private negotiations that brought us to this point have been going on for years—and the public’s review of the agreement has gone on for months. During that long period, President Obama and Secretary Kerry were clear in their goals: above all, that the United States will not allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon.

The United States also would not sign any agreement that takes Iran at its word or relies on trust alone. And at the most difficult crossroads of this time-consuming and technical negotiation, President Obama and Secretary Kerry made clear that they would not allow Iran.

Now it’s our turn. Now the United States has a choice to make: We can enforce an agreement that forces Iran to walk away from any nuclear-weapons program, or we can walk away from that agreement and assume responsibility for the consequences.

I take the strong position that we should block Iran from getting a nuclear bomb, or we can block this agreement and all but ensure Iran will have the fissile material it would need to make a weapon in a matter of months. But we cannot have it both ways. Make no mistake: blocking the bomb and blocking this agreement are two distinct choices that lead to very different outcomes.

I’ve spent a lot of time talking, listening, and thinking about the various elements of this agreement, and I can say this: I’ve heard from nuclear scientists, the intelligence community and our military leaders. I’ve listened to diplomats and experts. I’ve been briefed by Secretary Kerry and Undersecretary Sherman, by Secretaries Lew and Moniz—the brilliant nuclear physicist who knows more than almost anyone of the reality of this threat, the science behind the agreement and the agreement itself.

I’ve heard ardent supporters and passionate opponents. I’ve talked with Nevanids from across the world: this agreement will stand. America has said that we will do so.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And those consequences are, in fact, unacceptable.

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

We all recognize the threat of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps—the threat from Iran’s support for Hezbollah and Assad—of Iran’s brazen human rights violations toward its own people and toward those political prisoners and those who have disappeared. We recognize the danger Iran poses
to our allies, our interests, and our own troops and diplomats serving in the Middle East.

No one is blind to the threat Iran poses. But any Arab should forget that. Iran would become a threat of an entirely different magnitude if it ever were to have a nuclear weapon. I cannot think of a single challenge to our national security that wouldn’t get worse in that nightmare scenario.

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

We have no illusions about the Iranian regime—which is exactly why when we are presented with a day and a time to state that Iran’s nuclear ambitions, we must not let that chance slip through our fingers. We must support and enforce the agreement we have reached.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The agreement Iran signed forbids it from ever hiding its nuclear programs, científico’s data on nuclear materials, their heavy water plant, the heavy water reactor that will allow Iran to build a bomb, the heavy water reactor that will allow Iran to develop a new centrifuge, the centrifuge technology that is necessary to build a bomb.

We’ve known that for months. But when the Administration came to the table, we thought it was possible to strike a deal that would give us the ability to watch the program, to watch Iran, to find out if Iran cheats, to see if Iran cheats, to find out if Iran cheats.

And that’s what we’re supposed to do in this bill.

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

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

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

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

And to make sure this agreement succeeds, Congress must provide the oversight to ensure nuclear verification. At the same time, Congress must continue to hold the line against Iranian arms trafficking, its funding of terrorism, and demanding use of international sanctions regime, against inspections, against any international requirement that Iran backs off its nuclear program in any way. And Congress now assumes the responsibility to do so.

This is why I believe blocking the agreement would actually achieve the opposite of what opponents intend. Instead of being tougher on Iran, voting against this agreement could make it tougher for America, for Iran, for everyone.

That is why this agreement will stand. That is why this agreement will be the solution before us. That would be a tragedy of our own making—one we cannot allow.

I respect greatly the concerns I’ve heard about that this agreement is a repeat of what we did in the 1950s and the 1960s and the 1970s, that this agreement is a repeat of what we did in the 1950s and the 1960s and the 1970s. But again, no one should forget that Iran has already gotten its chance and a chance to get a bomb.

That’s what we’re doing—but only if the United States upholds and enforces this agreement.

The man who gave his name and for-
the real world, this really is the best option to keep Iran from a nuclear bomb.

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

The Senate, of course, has an important oversight role to play. When we voted nearly unanimously for the Iran Review Act, we voted to make that role real by considering three possible outcomes: no action at all, a resolution of approval, or a resolution of disapproval. It is absurd to argue with a straight face that by voting for a process with three possible and very different outcomes, senators somehow obligated themselves to vote to advance a specific outcome. That is not true.

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

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

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

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

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

America led the negotiations to stop any Iranian nuclear program, and now it is time for Congress to reaffirm America's leadership by supporting this agreement. We cannot and will not allow Iran to have a nuclear weapon. Neither the United States, nor Israel, our Gulf partners, a volatile Middle East, nor our friends the majority leader who repeatedly has said, most recently in 2007, that in the Senate it has always been the case we need 60 votes. This is my friend the majority leader when he was the leader of this majority in March of 2007, and he said it repeatedly both when he was in the minority as leader of the minority or leader of the majority, that it requires 60 votes certainly on a matter of this enormous importance, is not at all unusual. It is the way the Senate operates.

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

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

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

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

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

That is me—

It is pretty hard to make a credible case that denying a vote on cloture is anything other than a filibuster.

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

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

Again he came back a few months later:

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

He also said a short time later:

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

So says Senator McConnel.

A few months later:

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

That is me—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is not on either side of this aisle a more respected U.S. Senator than the Senator from Virginia, Tim Kaine. He was co-author of the Iran nuclear agreement, not a vote for it, because it required a 60-vote threshold.

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

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

Let me read this again. One of the provisions that I helped draft, and I think a respected Member of this body, said:

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

He continued:

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

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

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

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

Are Republicans stalling on this issue so they don’t have to work with Democrats to keep our government open and funded? There wasn’t a day that went by during the recess that we didn’t have some Republican Senator talk about closing the government.

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

Are Republicans stalling on this issue so they don’t have to work with us on a bipartisan cyber security bill?

Every day that goes by without legislation in this body is a day that bad guys are doing bad things to our businesses and to our country—stealing our names and addresses, trade secrets, everything they can, is what they are doing.

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

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

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2640

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The amendment is as follows:

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike line three and all that follows and insert:

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2641 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2640

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2643

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following. “This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2644 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2643

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “3” and insert “4”.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2645

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following. “This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment.”

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2646

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to commit the joint resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee with instructions to report back forthwith to amendment No. 2645.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “5” and insert “6”.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?
There appears to be a sufficient second. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Amendment No. 267 to Amendment No. 266

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk reads as follows:

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "6" and insert "7".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for unanimous consent that on Thursday, September 10, at 3 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote on the McConnell substitute amendment, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the resolution, as amended.

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I also want to propose the following request. I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61, the amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; further, that if the McConnell amendment is agreed to, H.J. Res. 61, as amended, be read a third time and passed; that the time today until 5 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; and that following leader remarks on Wednesday, September 9, until 6 p.m., the time be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; and that following leader remarks on Thursday, September 10, until 5:30 p.m., the time be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; and that following leader remarks on Thursday, September 10, until 5:30 p.m., the time be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; and that following leader remarks on Thursday, September 10, until 5:30 p.m., the time be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. President, that is my unanimous consent request.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, September 10, at 3 p.m., the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61 be agreed to, the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the resolution, as amended.

Mr. REID. I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this has been a very extraordinary period of measures that has come before the Senate in the time that I have served here. It is rare to have an issue of this historic moment, of this importance, one that literally raises a question about the peace and security of the Middle East, and one that has been considered so carefully by both sides of the aisle for such a long period of time. When I left for the August recess, here in the Senate, most of the Members on my side of the aisle—the Democratic side—were still processing and reviewing the proposed agreement. And, over the course of August, these Members announced their public positions on the matter.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Anything not approved by Congress is a mere executive agreement.

They continue:

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

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

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

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

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

Then they go on to say: Keep in mind we are going to be here a lot longer than any President; we may be the last person or the last group to make a decision about these agreements. Then they are basically reminding them that Presidents come and go, and don’t assume the next President...
will even honor an agreement reached by this President.

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

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

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

We have 5 hours (closed hearing) when it was not good judgment. I would like to stipulate that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee did not sign this letter. I want to make sure that is clear on the floor. But the 47 who did have the President: Why? When we are in delicate negotiations as the United States of America, and we don’t have a final agreement, why would 47 Republican Senators want to intervene in those negotiations? Why would they want to waste the Ayatollah’s time and the President’s time and to waste your time negotiating with this President.

It is troublesome. Many of them had reached a conclusion even before the agreement was written that they were going to oppose it. Witness this letter. But others took time to consider it, to measure it, and to announce their position when it came to this matter. I respect them for doing that, even if they came to a different conclusion than the one that was reached on our Democratic side because I was in contact with virtually with every Member of our Senate Democratic Caucus during the month of August, talking to them about this.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Before we left for the August recess, we sat down with the five Ambassadors from the United States and the other four of the five countries which are part of the negotiations. I looked across the table there to see the Ambassadors from China, from Russia, from the United Kingdom, and representatives of the embassies of Germany and France. I thought to myself, if you are a student of history, this is an amazing coalition: China, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and the United States all working together. And we brought into the sanctions regime other countries that didn’t have the power or the involvement in negotiations but were with us. South Korea is a good example. Japan, another good example, joined us in this effort to put pressure on Iran. President Obama led this effort, and he was successful in this effort. The Iranians came to the negotiating table because we put the pressure on them—economic pressure that brought them to that moment.

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

Just recently an announcement made by Colin Powell, a man I respect very much, in support of this agreement. It was an announcement which surprised me in a way. I didn’t know if he was going to take a position on this matter, but this article states: Former Secretary of State Colin Powell expressed support for the [Obama] nuclear agreement with Iran on Sunday, saying the various planks Iranian leaders accepted “remarkable” and dismissing critics’ concerns over its implementation.

“It’s a pretty good deal,” he said on NBC’s “Meet the Press.”

Critics concerned that the deal will expedite Iran’s pursuit of a nuclear weapon, Powell added, “are forgetting the reality that [Iranian leaders] have been on a superhighway since the last few years, to create a nuclear weapon or a nuclear weapons program with no speed limit.”

He said the reduction in centrifuges, Iran’s uranium stockpile and their agreement to let independent inspectors to verify that Iran is following the agreement. Powell said that, “with respect to the Iranians—don’t trust, never trust, and always verify.”

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

“I say, we have a deal, let’s see how they implement the deal. If it is not something that brings them to that moment, it, bail out. None of our options are gone,” Powell added.

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

I will have other things to say on this matter, as others will. You can never yield the floor to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am going to have more lengthy comments to make on this a little bit later, but I want to start of all: I thank the Senator from Illinois for his comments, and I certainly want to thank Senator CARDIN—and I will do so more fully in
just a moment. But I would like to remind the body that, yes, we went through several steps along the way to get to where we are today that certainly created consternation on both sides of the aisle. There were lots of things that occurred. A letter was referred to the Joint Congress. There have been numbers of things along the way that have caused people to concern themselves that maybe this debate would end up being something that was partisan and of low value.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would also like to remind people that without the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act there would be no role for Congress. One of the things I think has confused a lot of the American people—and there are a lot of people who would prefer this to have been a treaty—is the fact that under our form of government, the President is able to decide whether he is going to submit an agreement as a treaty or as an executive agreement. An executive agreement stays in place during the duration of that President’s tenure and could be altered by the next President. A treaty is binding on future Presidents.

This President, as we know, decided to go directly to the U.N. Security Council and, by the way, lift some congressionally mandated sanctions that we all helped put in place that actually would have made any potential executive agreement, I know this has been confusing to numbers of people, but this was the only vehicle capable of winning a veto-proof majority to provide Congress with this chance—a chance for the American people to have us, on their behalf, review this agreement and then vote.

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

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

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

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

The thing that is one of the most troubling aspects of this is that through the course of these negotiations, the leverage—the way right now, basically, the world community has had its boot on a rogue nation’s throat—in 9 months the leverage shifts from these nations—our nation being one of those—having them in a position where they might be thinking that ends their program to now, where instead what happens is the leverage shifts to Iran. The leverage shifts to Iran.

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

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

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

So instead of our having leverage over them, they are going to have leverage over us. They are going to have leverage over us. This is in the vacuum of having no Middle Eastern policy, I would like to say this to the Senate. We know we have no policy in the Middle East to push back against Iran. We know that. So this agreement is going to end up being our de facto policy, and everything is going to be measured by this. What will Iran do if we push back?

What if we push back against the fact that they are giving Hamas rockets to fire into Israel? What if we push back against what Hezbollah is doing in Lebanon and what are they doing in Syria? We push back against that the IRGC—the arm of the Supreme Leader—is doing right now to protect Assad? They are the shock force to keep Assad in power right now. We know that. But right now, they are providing support to them. We have an $18 trillion GDP and they have a $406 billion GDP. The leverage shifts to Iran. The leverage shifts to Iran.
We know that—the fact that they are going to have some resources to do more of that, to do the same thing with the Houthis in Yemen, to support terrorists and people who are trying to disrupt the Government of Bahrain.

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

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

I think everyone here knows—the people sitting in the audience, people watching—that Iran has no practical need whatsoever for this program—none. I don’t get why they are doing it. Here is a country with 19,000 centrifuges—10,000 of them operating. They have an underground facility at Fordow. They have a facility at Arak that produces plutonium. They have all kinds of research and development.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CORNER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I say to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee how much I appreciate his good work, together with the ranking member Senator CARDIN, whom he added to earlier, but the Senator from Tennessee just said something which I think every American should find troubling, and that is perhaps the single most important national security issue facing us at the moment. For his leadership. I thank him for his leadership. I thank him for his willingness to seek a place where the Senate can deal with this in the appropriate way.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

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

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

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

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

Senator DURBIN—I listened to his comments. Senator DURBIN is a dear friend of mine. The two of us have fought together on human rights issues around the globe. We have fought for civil liberties in the United States. We have worked together on so many important issues, including in the Middle East. We deeply disagree, and people will certainly be speaking strongly about the pros and cons of this agreement.

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

With that, without objection, I wish to yield the floor to my great friend, the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee. Together, we have marched through some incredible hearings. I think all of us have studied this dutifully. That could not have occurred without his incredible cooperation and that of his staff. I thank him for that.

I think everyone in this great country will be shown that same respect and expect that their Senators and their House Members will have the opportunity to vote on the actual policy which has been negotiated.

What did that have to do with the conventional weapons ban after 5 years? What did that have to do with the conventional weapons ban after 5 years? What did that have to do with the conventional weapons ban after 5 years? What did that have to do with the conventional weapons ban after 5 years?
Iran does not become a nuclear weapons state, and we honestly believe our view is the best way for that to be accomplished. I don't challenge any other Member's decision, and I certainly don't question their resolve against Iran becoming a nuclear weapons state or their their resolution. I think each has demonstrated that throughout their career. Some of us have come to different conclusions.

I strongly believe we must prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state. It is a game-changer in the region. We have already heard from my colleagues that Iran is one of the principal purveyors of terrorism in that region. It would accelerate an arms race that already has too many arms in its region. It would make it so much more difficult to confront Iranian policy if they possess a nuclear weapon. President Obama is right to say we will not let that happen and that all options are on the table to make sure that doesn't happen. Iran also understands that is to move forward with the agreement—an agreement negotiated by the Obama administration. Others believe that is not the case.

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

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

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

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

I wish to mention one thing, though, that I wish to mention one thing, though, that I wish to second what Senator Corker said about the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. I was proud to be part of putting that bill together and gaining broad support in the Congress and the support of the administration. I think it put us in a much stronger position in negotiating in Vienna. I think the fact that we had set up the right way for a congressional review—that it was going to be a transparent review, a critical review—put our nego
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Tennessee.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

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

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

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

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

I was optimistic that the administration would produce an agreement that would accomplish the goals the President laid out. Along with six of my Republican colleagues, I signed a letter to the leaders of the Iranian Government sent in the midst of the negotiations because I wanted to give the administration every opportunity to complete an agreement that would have accomplished the President himself originally set forth as the purpose of these negotiations.

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

Mark Dubowitz, a noted expert on sanctions, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: “If Iran does not violate the JCPOA . . . it will have patient pathways to nuclear weapons, an ICBM program, access to heavy weaponry, an economy immunized against sanctions pressure, and a more powerful regional position . . . .”

Under the agreement, not a single one of Iran’s 19,000 centrifuges, used to enrich uranium to produce the fissile material for a nuclear bomb, will be destroyed. Nor is a single dollar of the billions of dollars transferred to Iran in the form of frozen assets and overseas accounts. Iran also will once again be able to sell its abundant oil in global markets.

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

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

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

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

Think about that for a moment. Why would Iran want to buy intercontinental ballistic missile technology? It already has the deep troubling capacity to build strikes and a warhead with which it has pledged to wipe off the face of the Earth. ICBM technology poses a direct threat to our Nation from a nation whose leaders continue to chant “Death to America.”

We should not forget that the Iranian Quds forces were the source of the most lethal improvised explosive devices that were responsible for the deaths of hundreds of our servicemembers in Iraq.

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

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

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

Iran cheated. Not only did it never report to international arms control experts about the experiments at its military installation at Parchin, where Iran is suspected of developing detonators for nuclear devices, but also Iran sanitized buildings at Parchin in a manner that the IAEA has described as likely to have undermined the agency’s ability to conduct effective verification. Following public reporting, Iran has continued these sanitization activities while Congress was holding hearings on the agreement this summer.

In 2010, the U.N. Security Council adopted another resolution requiring Iran to cease any activities related to ballistic missile activities capable of delivering nuclear weapons. What happened? Iran cheated. It launched ballistic missiles in July 2012. Given this history, there is no question in my mind that Iran will try to cheat on the new agreement and exploit any loophole in the text or in the implementing Security Council resolution by the way, as the chairman has pointed out, adopted before Congress even had a chance to vote on the agreement.

Given Iran’s history of noncompliance, one would think an ironclad inspection process would be put in place. Sadly, that is far from the reality of this agreement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

To prevent Iran from cheating, the administration has repeatedly pointed to the prospect of an immediate snapback of sanctions as the teeth of the agreement. I will be surprised if they do not advertise that if Iran cheats, the rhetoric on the snapback of sanctions is inconsistent. On the one hand, the administration says the United States can unilaterally cause the international sanctions to be reimposed. At the same time, the administration repeatedly warns us that the sanctions regime is falling apart. Which is it?

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

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

Let’s think about the implications of that for a moment. The Iranians are saying a sanction is a
sanction, and Iran appears ready to resume its nuclear activities if any sanctions are reimposed, even if the purpose is nonnuclear, even if the purpose is to halt Iran’s financing of terrorists groups.

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

Third, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, the agreement states that sanctions would not be applied “with retroactive effect to contracts signed between any party and Iran or Iranian entities prior to the date of application.” This grandfathering clause will create an immediate rush of businesses to lock in long-term business contracts with Iran. Iran can memeister Zarate, the lateral financial and economic power more than 200 times.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

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

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

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT JOE GLINIEWICZ

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

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

Everyone knew GI Joe in Fox Lake, IL. He served on the town’s police force for 32 years. He was supposed to retire at the end of last month, but he stayed on just 1 more month to ensure the smooth transition of a volunteer youth program to which he devoted thousands of hours over nearly 30 years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This resident added:

On a rainy weekend in his community, he took pride in it. This is where he lived, and it’s what he fought to protect. He took great pride in making the town of Fox Lake the place it is.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz was a volunteer with the Special Olympics and a lot of other groups. The organization he was closest to was Fox Lake Police Department Explorers, a group
who mentors young people who want to aspire to law enforcement. Joe Gliniewicz established Fox Lake’s Explorer Post No. 300 nearly 30 years ago.

Over the years, he has seen hundreds of explorers in training get into law enforcement and the military. His death is felt by the youngest of his colleagues, by Lieutenant Gliniewicz’s family, friends, and neighbors, and by his brothers and sisters in blue not only in Fox Lake but throughout Illinois and across America.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz was the first on-duty officer fatally shot in Lake County, IL, since 1980 and the third law enforcement fatality in Illinois this year, according to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund. According to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, firearms-related deaths of law enforcement officers in the United States are down 21 percent this year compared to the same period last year, January 1 to September 8. There were 34 last year and 26 this year. While that downward trend is good news, even one police officer killed in the line of duty is too many.

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

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

Lieutenant Gliniewicz really made a difference in people’s lives. It is sad to lose someone who reflects on the contribution he made to his community, to his county, to my State of Illinois, and to our Nation, it is with heartfelt gratitude that we say to his family: We are by your side. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as have all of our colleagues, I have been traveling around my State over the last few weeks, talking to my constituents and trying to understand what their concerns are. I have to tell my colleagues that Washington is not in high repute. People sense the country is heading in the wrong direction. They have entrusted us with the way to navigate that, and they feel as though we have not succeeded in getting our country back on the right track. I know that when it comes to security issues—and of all the issues the Federal Government deals with, national security is the one that many people want to speak out on, to get something to someone else. It is our No. 1 responsibility as a Federal Government. State government can’t do it. Local government can’t do it. We can’t do it for ourselves, so we depend on the Federal Government to make sure our Nation is safe and secure, which is a precondition for all of the other liberties and privileges we enjoy.

As part of those visits and talks, I had, I took part in one in Houston, TX, where we addressed a wide variety of issues, but the No. 1 issue that came up was the Iranian nuclear deal.

There is no issue more compelling or concerning to this particular group of folks than his home, than the President’s deal with Iran because people recognize that Iran is a state sponsor of international terrorism, and what this does is it paves the way to them getting bigger and more lethal weapons.

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

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

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

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

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

Here is what the President said. I guess he has resigned himself to it. He said: “The truth is that Iran has always been a way to fund these efforts.” Well, that does not make me feel any more at ease, nor should it make any of our allies feel any more at ease about Iran and its intentions and what it will do with these funds that will be relieved from sanctions. That does not even address the million barrels of oil a day which now Iran will be able to ply to markets all around the world and the revenue they will be able to generate from that.

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

Well, just digressing a moment and talking again about this threatened partisan filibuster of the resolution of disapproval—and again I hope and pray our colleagues across the aisle, the 41 who have said they will vote against the resolution of disapproval—I hope they will reconsider if they are even thinking about a partisan filibuster of the resolution itself and not even getting to the resolution of disapproval. They have every right to vote according to their conscience and as they believe they should vote on the resolution of disapproval, but the idea of blocking a vote by a filibuster—just
strikes me as reckless and irresponsible, especially in light of this: I mentioned this to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a few moments ago, but I will come back to it because I find it so shocking. In the Wall Street Journal, there was a discussion or actually a report from the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the Supreme Leader of Iran, who declared Thursday—it said in this story of September 8, 2015 that the Iranian Parliament would have the final word on the deal. It says the Parliament speaker delivered a similar message to reporters in New York later in the day, saying he supports the deal which would lift crippling economic sanctions on Iran in return for curbs on the country’s nuclear activities. The speaker of the Iranian Parliament said the agreement needs to be discussed and it needs to be approved by the Iranian Parliament. There will be heated discussions and debate.

I would hate the fact, if it was to occur—and I hope it does not—that the Iranian Parliament would have a more open, accountable, and democratic process than the Senate. I hope we do not become the road to a self-inflicted wound no matter how this resolution turns out. It would be a mistake, it would be a self-inflicted wound to the Senate and to the respect which we would like to garner from the American people. They would see this as business as usual, and I think it would add to their disgust. I hope Members, as they return to Washington today and as we begin to debate this deal, I hope they will recall—and let me, just in a brief few minutes, refresh some of their collective live memories about Iran’s long history of terrorism against the United States and our allies. I actually had a chance last week when I was in Dallas, TX, to meet with a gentleman named Rick Upke in Dallas, TX. He actually lives in Arlington, TX, right between Fort Worth and Dallas.

But Rick was a former U.S. Foreign Service officer. He has learned firsthand how the Iranian regime targets and attacks Americans because he was the last American captured in 1979 at the U.S. Embassy in Iran during the Iranian hostage crisis. He was one of dozens of Americans held in captivity for 444 days and 135 of those days, a constant threat and constant threat of death. But many will also remember two other terrorist bombings that occurred in 1983 that targeted American citizens. One blew up the U.S. Embassy in Beirut and the other blew up the U.S. Marine barracks at Beirut International Airport. Combined, these bombings killed more than 250 American citizens, including 8 Texans, 7 of them marines and another a soldier.

It is well known and documented that these attacks were perpetrated by the terrorist group Hezbollah under the direction of the Iranian regime. That is how the Iranian regime does its dirty work. It does it through proxies, not directly but through proxies like Hezbollah. Iran, while it has denied any involvement in these attacks, does not shy away from celebrating these bombings that have killed hundreds of Americans and our allies. In more recent years, Iran has sponsored the terrorist group Hezbollah, which threatens Israel’s northern border, against which Iran has sown chaos across the Middle East, attacking the United States and our allies. In 2004, a little more than 20 Americans died at the hands of Shiite militias who were equipped by Iran with different types of lethal weapons. In 2007, Iran supplied explosively formed penetrators, which melted the armor used to shield Americans and our allies in Iraq, were produced by the Iranian Government, and the Quds Force trained people to use those against Americans and our allies.

Then, right here in our Nation’s Capital just 4 years ago, Iranian officials were implicated in a plot to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador to the United States. That plot reportedly included plans to bomb the Israeli Embassy in Washington as well. That is a staggering list of aggressions against the United States and our allies, both at home and abroad since the Iranian regime came to power in 1979. But Rick and I both were invited today to discuss the Iranian fingerprints on the havoc being wreaked in the Middle East, from Yemen to Syria, to Iraq. In all the major hotspots of the world, Iranian fingerprints are all over these activities. Of course, Iran has long sponsored militant groups on Israel’s borders, which have attacked Israel with rockets, hundreds of rockets and terror.

In southern Lebanon, Iran funds and supplies the militias which threatens Israel’s northern border, against which Iran went to war in 2006. In Gaza, on Israel’s southwestern border, Iran has long sponsored Hamas. Particularly as Iranian-Hamas relations have frayed in recent years, Iran has sponsored the Palestinian Islamic Jihad. Suffice it to say that over the years, Iran has sown chaos across the Middle East, attacking the United States and our allies, while publicly celebrating the death of Americans in Tehran. So with this regime’s long history of aggression against the United States and its allies, I find it troubling that the President characterizes any thoughtful questioning of the merits of this deal as akin to warmongering. That is what the President has said: If you don’t like this deal, the alternative is war. To which I would say: Wrong, Mr. President. The alternative to this deal is a better deal.

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

Well, this debate and this vote are simply too important for it to degenerate into partisanship. I know this is something the Senator from Tennessee feels very strongly about. He has tried to elevate the debate and to work in a bipartisan way to bring us to this vote on a resolution this week. I hope we don’t follow the President down this low road of partisan rhetoric, which actually only serves to distract us from examining the deal and engaging the true danger of the regime that we are somehow making common cause with and hoping against hope that they won’t continue at some point to break out and pursue those nuclear weapons.

This is not like the Soviet Union. This is not Ronald Reagan negotiating with the Soviet Union. This is a theocratic regime that is led by an Islamic extremist who has American and other allied blood on his hands and makes no bones about it. So this debate needs help. The American people find the answer to this crucial question. I think it boils down to this: Will this deal make America and our allies safer? I think that ultimately is the question.

As we prepare to vote on this resolution of disapproval, I hope that we will have a civil, enthusiastic, and spirited debate, as the speaker of the Iranian Parliament said they will have in their debate, and we will be able to openly and honestly discuss different points of view. That is the Senate is supposed to be—a place where that can happen and where it should happen. The American people deserve that kind of debate, not a partisan filibuster that cuts off the debate prematurely and tries to hide the debate, as the speaker of the Iranian Parliament said they will have in their debate, and hoping against hope that they won’t continue at some point to break out and pursue those nuclear weapons.
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This is not like the Soviet Union. This is not Ronald Reagan negotiating with the Soviet Union. This is a theocratic regime that is led by an Islamic extremist who has American and other allied blood on his hands and makes no bones about it. So this debate needs help. The American people find the answer to this crucial question. I think it boils down to this: Will this deal make America and our allies safer? I think that ultimately is the question.
Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today for a sad occasion, and that is to remember the lives of two Virginians, Alison Parker and Adam Ward, the journalists who were gunned down on live TV in Roanoke, VA, just a couple of weeks ago, as they covered a local news story.

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

We saw during the summer a set of these tragedies in Roanoke, VA, my wife's hometown, in Charleston, SC, in Lafayette, LA, and in Chattanooga, Tennessee. The saddest day in my history in Virginia. Everybody knows where they were, and everybody knew somebody connected to it.

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

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

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

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

Now, the problem is a whole lot of these people do get weapons because folks either give or sell them to them. What is the current law with respect to giving or selling a weapon to somebody who is prohibited?

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

I hope we can have our colleagues on this side of the aisle hear what I have heard and what I have written, and I hope we can have them move to stop this process. I hope that they will be allowed to have their voices heard.

Mr. THUNE, Madam President, I rise today to discuss the Iran nuclear deal. We are here today because several months ago Senators Corker and Coons and Coast Guard and the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee worked out an agreement to allow us to have this debate voted on here in the Senate, and there were 98 votes in support of allowing debate on the Iran nuclear deal.

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

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

So I am looking forward to this discussion. I hope we can have our colleagues on this side of the next few days we will have a chance to air this out because it is clear that one of the greatest threats to our national security is the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran.

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

There are numerous reasons to be concerned about a nuclear-armed Iran.

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

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

In response to Iran's nuclear activities 9 years ago, in 2006, the U.N. and the United States began to impose sanctions on Iran's nuclear enrichment.
program. These sanctions were dramatically increased in 2010. The sanctions targeted Iranian businesses and financial institutions as well as members of Iran’s Revolutionary Guard Corps or IRGC, who were responsible for killing hundreds of Americans and froze thousands of billions of dollars that had previously been used by Iran to support terrorism throughout the region. This had a tremendous impact, effectively bringing Iran to its knees.

Thanks to the pressures the sanctions exerted on Iran’s economy, Iran’s leadership was under immense pressure to negotiate with the United States and its allies. In 2013 Iran agreed to engage in talks regarding its nuclear program. However, soon after Iran agreed to come to the negotiating table, the Obama administration inexplicably began making concession after concession, with Iran giving up very little in return. The result—a weak deal that is highly unlikely to stop Iran from becoming more dangerous Iran, exerting its resources without constraints.

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

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

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

Unfortunately, instead of acknowledging this when it was raised in committee, Secretary Kerry took on the role of apologist for Iran, defending the deal by saying that private agreements with the IAEA are the norm. However, if the leaked information regarding soil samples is correct, this calls into question the entire credibility of the inspections regime. For this reason and many others, I strongly oppose President Obama’s proposed nuclear agreement with Iran, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

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

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

Since the Iran agreement was first announced in July, the Obama administration has repeatedly stated that we should at least give this deal a try, arguing that if Iran breaks its side of the agreement and pursues a nuclear weapon, we would have military options down the road that we have today. However, that is not true. We will not have the same options in the future that we have today. Right now, if a situation arose where Iran entered a nuclear weapons program, we would have the capability to conduct a targeted air strike on Iran’s enrichment facilities. For example, if we knew that Iran was using its nuclear enrichment facility at Fordow to enrich weapons-grade uranium, we could utilize our air superiority with bunker-buster bombs. Obviously, we would prefer to avoid a military strike, but if needed, we have that option. And that is what this agreement will do.

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

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

On page 17 of Annex 1 of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, under the section titled “Centrifuge Manufacturing,” the agreement states that at the end of year 8:

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

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

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

Referring once again to the facility at Fordow, when Fordow was first constructed, it was built to contain 3,000 IR–1 centrifuges, which meant that the facility had to be 12 stories tall. Under this agreement, Iran is allowed to have up to 10,000 IR–6 and IR–8 centrifuges, however, are estimated to be 15 times more efficient than the IR–1 centrifuges used at Fordow, which means that by using IR–8 centrifuges, Iran could replicate the enrichment capability of a facility like Fordow, but with a building not more than 3,000 centrifuges, but only 200 centrifuges. Such a facility can be the size of a house. By reducing the size of the facilities by this magnitude, Iran could build many Fordows in multiple locations, hiding them more easily and putting them deeper underground. Such facilities could be built within existing mines, making them extremely difficult to find.

As mentioned before, this agreement guarantees Iran will have the manufacturing capacity it needs to build these advanced centrifuges. Even within the parameters of this agreement, Iran could manufacture 200 IR–6 centrifuges and 200 IR–8 centrifuges per year starting around year 8. Since Iran would already have the manufacturing capacity for building IR–8 centrifuges, it would merely need to ramp up the production beyond the terms of the agreement and in a short period of time it could have hundreds of advanced enrichment facilities in multiple locations throughout the country. By the time these violations had been discovered and confirmed, the advanced centrifuges would likely be in place, and Iran would have likely enough enriched uranium for a bomb. But there is much more to it than that. Currently, according to publicly available sources, Iran’s air defense capabilities consist of domestically produced, short-range surface-to-air missiles and Russian made, longer range SA–2 and SA–5 surface-to-air missiles, as well as a few Chinese CSA–1s. These systems are vulnerable to electronic countermeasures and pose very little
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threat to American or even Israeli aircraft.

However, that is not where Iran’s air defenses will be in 10 years. Under this agreement, the ban on conventional weapons sales to Iran will be lifted after 15 years. Iran has already agreed to sell Iran four batteries of S-300 vehicle-launched surface-to-air missiles. Depending upon the sophistication of these S-300 missile systems, they may be able to engage aircraft up to 200 miles away.

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

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

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

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

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

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

One of the main national security concerns we have regarding the IRGC is that Iran uses it to support terrorist organizations. Iran is the main supporter of Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza, both of which have provoked conflicts with Israel in recent years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

However, another plausible outcome following congressional rejection of the deal would be for Iran to try to capitalize on congressional disapproval by seeking to divide Russia and China from the West to undermine the multilateral sanctions regime. Iran could try to achieve this by implementing certain commitments from the agreement back to negotiations where we can achieve a better outcome.

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

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30
minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be equally divided. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

I am proud to be a lawyer. I have practiced both in the criminal and civil bars and served as a prosecutor. I have appeared before many different courts. I look at the men and women who have been on our courts, and I say: Here is an example of the way the judicial system can work. Everywhere I went—especially rural communities down when we controlled the Senate—that is so difficult and so essential to get health care to women—

Mr. LEAHY. They are asking: Why do the Republicans want to put the criminal justice system works for everyone?

Let's give one example. The last 2 years of President Bush's tenure in office, the Democrats controlled the Senate. By this time, we had confirmed 26 judicial nominees up for a vote. The Republican leadership to bring this highly qualified nominee up for a vote. The continued delay of Judge Restrepo is a poor reflection on this body.

Judges in states with at least one Republican Senator. Of the 67 current vacancies, 8 states with at least one Republican Senator are the only thing holding up his nomination. I hope the Republican Senator from Pennsylvania will implore his leadership to bring this highly qualified nominee up for a vote. The continued delay of Judge Restrepo is a poor reflection on this body.

In the Western District of New York, located in Buffalo, there is not a single active Federal district judge, even though it has one of the busiest case-loads in the country. And there are more criminal cases than in Washington, DC. Buffalo would not be able to handle the number of criminal cases than in Washington, DC. Buffalo would not be able to handle the number of judicial emergencies. Incredibly, one of those district court positions has been vacant for over 4 years. A Fifth Circuit position in Texas has been vacant for more than 3 years. Pennsylvania and Alabama face similar crises. They have many judicial vacancies, respectively. Federal courts in other States are grappling with extended vacancies. They desperately need to be filled.

The length of time that some of these vacancies have existed is staggering. In Texas, none of these vacancies currently have nominees because the Texas Senators have been slow in providing recommendations to the President. A similar pattern can be seen with the Alabama vacancies, where two of the positions have been vacant for over 2 years, and another has remained vacant for over 1 1/2 years.

In Pennsylvania, there are six current vacancies and five nominees pending. Senate Republicans should be trying to move these judicial emergency vacancies to just 43, but now we are going to vote on the nomination of Roseann Ketchmark. She has been nominated to be a Federal district judge in the Western District of Missouri. She is only the sixth judicial nominee that we have voted on since the Senate Republicans took over the majority 8 months ago, so less than 1 a month. In fact, if we continue at this rate the Republican majority has established, we will confirm the fewest number of judges in more than a half century—resulting in a judicial vacancy crisis. I am concerned because the Senate Republican leadership has refused to schedule timely confirmation votes for nominees which I think, demonstrates an astounding neglect of the needs of our independent third branch, which borders on contempt.

I am proud to be a lawyer. I have practiced both in the criminal and civil bars and served as a prosecutor. I have appeared before many different courts. I look at the men and women who have been on our courts, and I say: Here is an example of the way the judicial system can work. Everywhere I went—especially rural communities down when we controlled the Senate—that is so difficult and so essential to get health care to women—

Mr. LEAHY. They are asking: Why do the Republicans want to put the criminal justice system works for everyone?

Let's give one example. The last 2 years of President Bush's tenure in office, the Democrats controlled the Senate. By this time, we had confirmed 26 judicial nominees up for a vote. The Republican leadership to bring this highly qualified nominee up for a vote. The continued delay of Judge Restrepo is a poor reflection on this body.

In the Western District of New York, located in Buffalo, there is not a single active Federal district judge, even though it has one of the busiest case-loads in the country. And there are more criminal cases than in Washington, DC. Buffalo would not be able to handle the number of criminal cases than in Washington, DC. Buffalo would not be able to handle the number of judicial emergencies. Incredibly, one of those district court positions has been vacant for over 4 years. A Fifth Circuit position in Texas has been vacant for more than 3 years. Pennsylvania and Alabama face similar crises. They have many judicial vacancies, respectively. Federal courts in other States are grappling with extended vacancies. They desperately need to be filled.

The length of time that some of these vacancies have existed is staggering. In Texas, none of these vacancies currently have nominees because the Texas Senators have been slow in providing recommendations to the President. A similar pattern can be seen with the Alabama vacancies, where two of the positions have been vacant for over 2 years, and another has remained vacant for over 1 1/2 years.
I said earlier, the Republican-controlled Senate allowed confirmation votes on just five judges—one, two, three, four, five. They have taken vacations, recesses, long weekends, and leave early—but we don’t have time to vote on judges, which are normally unanimous votes anyway.

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

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

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

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

The majority leader has spoken recently about his desire to avoid another Republican-led government shutdown. I agree, the American people deserve something better than obstructionist shutdowns. While the focus has been on the threat of Republicans shutting down the government over women’s health services, the Senate Republicans have had full control down the judicial confirmation process. It is harming our justice system in the short and long term.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll. Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUCCI).

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

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

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

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The Senator from South Dakota.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

CELEBRATING LABOR DAY AND AMERICAN WORKERS

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

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

It is important to stand up for the workers who have built this country. They laid down the railroad tracks that move people and products across the country. They work on shop floors. They innovate as they labor. They toil and sweat, toil and tears of American workers.

I visited an Airstream plant in Shelby County and a Continental ContiTech plant in St. Mary’s. I toured the Amish clothes operation in Darke County, a rural county west and north of Dayton, OH. He started making jeans in Arcanum, OH. His son, B.J. Nickol, is a co-owner and company president. B.J. told me that “it is not about greed for us. It is about giving people jobs and making a decent living.”

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

I visited a Hart Schaffner Marx suit facility in Brooklyn, OH, a suburb of Cleveland.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Because not as many people belong to unions today—that is why we need to pass the Healthy Families Act, which will give workers the ability to earn paid family leave.

Senator Wyden. Mr. President, this year is the 200th anniversary of one of the wisest decisions Congress ever made. In 1815, Congress acquired the entirety of Thomas Jefferson’s personal library to
replace Congress’s library, which was burnt by the British Army the previous year. I would like to take a few moments to recognize this anniversary and to focus on the good work one small Library Program does.

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

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

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

Recognizing creativity, learning, passion, and imagination, and the Library of Congress continues to help ignite it. I could not be more pleased to see communities in Oregon benefitting from this program.

CONGRATULATING KATIE ROTH

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

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

Katie was named by her peers for consideration of this prestigious award. It is no surprise to me that my fellow Iowans would sing her praises. Without hesitation, I endorse Katie’s selection as the 2015 Business Owner of the Year.

Now this tactic—to feature a tip line number on billboards along with a suspect’s photo—is a common tool for law enforcement. In 2007 in Philadelphia, the FBI starting using donated electronic “digital” billboards to help find fugitives. The FBI calls these high-tech tips “wanted” billboards multiple times before they shared tips. Second is the emphasis on anonymity, important to those who fear retribution, according to Sergeant Sarver.

Now, Sergeant Sarver, who retired in 2008 after 33 years on the force, cites two reasons why billboards help generate solid tips for police. First, he says, is the frequency of the message. Tipsters have said they had seen “wanted” billboards multiple times before they shared tips. Second is the emphasis on anonymity, important to those who fear retribution, according to Sergeant Sarver.

Crime Stoppers is separate from the police emergency phone system or other standard methods of contacting police, as it allows a member of the community to provide anonymous information about criminal activity. In 1999, greater Kansas City Crime Stoppers emerged as a top program, earning national recognition for Kansas City Police Commissioner Craig Sarver of the Kansas City Police Department was named International—Crime Stoppers—Coordinator of the Year.

An innovator, Sergeant Sarver nurtured an idea that has evolved into a common tool for law enforcement. In the summer of 2002, 19-year-old Ali Kemp was murdered in the pump house at a community swimming pool near Kansas City. Her father, Roger Kemp, suggested to police and the local office of Lamar Advertising Company that billboards could help find the killer.

Eventually, a tip generated by a billboard resulted in the arrest of this case. A suspect was arrested in Connecticut, tried, and convicted.

Since then, “wanted” billboards have led to arrests in more than 20 murder cases in the Kansas City area. Sarver, who retired in 2008 after 33 years on the force, cites two reasons why billboards help generate solid tips for police. First, he says, is the frequency of the message. Tipsters have said they had seen “wanted” billboards multiple times before they shared tips. Second is the emphasis on anonymity, important to those who fear retribution, according to Sergeant Sarver.
Neil Mahan, the retired police chief from Janesville, WI, says billboards help police apprehend suspected criminals and deliver other information to the public. “For example,” he wrote in The Police Chief magazine, “an elderly female suffering from Alzheimer’s ease wandered away from family at a local shopping mall and was found by a citizen using the digital billboard information. When spring floods along the Rock River posed significant danger to the public, billboards were used to post warnings about the danger.”

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

RECOGNIZING THE JOHN R. ELLIOTT HERO CAMPAIGN FOR DESIGNATED DRIVERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF L. MASON CAPITANI

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

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

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

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

I applaud the employees of L. Mason Capitani for demonstrating the hard work and dedication to service required for 50 years of success. Family businesses like L. Mason Capitani are the main drivers of the economy in Michigan and across the United States. L. Mason Capitani is well aware of its role in supporting economic opportunity and quality of life in communities across the State of Michigan, including Detroit, where the company embraces the opportunity for it to grow while contributing to efforts to rebuild one of America’s greatest cities.

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

REMEMBERING JOSEPH SCANLON

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

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

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

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

It was very sad news.

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

Again, I know the questions to ask and the people to call. He worked tirelessly with his staff. He returned calls and wrote letters promptly and exhausted
every option available to the constituent. Joe truly cared about Rhode Island and its people. And he got results.

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

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

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

Godspeed, my friend.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGESREFERRED

In executive session the President of the Senate received the messages from the President of the United States and submitted sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

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

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

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

H.R. 2131. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 North Topeka Street in Chariton, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center".

H.R. 2369. An act to designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the enrolled bills were signed on August 6, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. Hatch).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–2532. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-074); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2533. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-076); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2534. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-082); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2535. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-089); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2536. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-084); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

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

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

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

EC–2541. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 24-Hour PM2.5 NAAQS" (FRL No. 9932–06–Re gn 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2542. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead (Pb) and the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)" (FRL No. 9932–72–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2543. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Florida; Miscellaneous Changes" (FRL No. 9932–25–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

EC–2545. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio; Miscellaneous Changes" (FRL No. 9932–23–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

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

EC–2548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Interstate Transport of Pollution to the 2006 24-Hour PM2.5 NAAQS" (FRL No. 9932–05–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
EC-2549. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0088)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2557. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0570)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2565. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0088)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2566. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0524)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2558. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0778)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2559. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0783)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2567. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Inc. Helicopters” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0990)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2568. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Inc. Helicopters” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0990)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2569. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Inc. Helicopters” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0990)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2570. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Inc. Helicopters” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0990)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2571. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Kaman Aerospace Corporation (Kaman Helicopters)” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0758)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2572. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives;
Honeywell International Inc., Turbo Prop Engines’ (RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2006–23706) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2573. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Airworthiness Directives; Piston Airplanes’’ (RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–2343) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2574. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Airworthiness Directives; PISTUS AIRCRAFT COMPANY, LLC Airplanes’’ (RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–2345) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2575. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Canada Inc., Canada, Limited Liability Company Airplanes’’ (RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1177) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2576. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Airworthiness Directives; GA 8 Airvan (Pty) Ltd Airplanes’’ (RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–2344) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2577. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Airworthiness Directives; Przediesiebiorstwo Dosadowczo-szlufowe Przychodniewidzta, PZL–Bieleko’’ (RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–9961) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

EC–2580. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines’’ (RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0165) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

EC–2582. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Amendment of Class E Airspace; New Orleans, LA’’ (RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–2319) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2583. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Amendment of Class E Airspace; Dyersburg, TN’’ (RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–9968) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2584. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Amendment of Class E Airspace; Campbellsville, KY’’ (RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0436) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2585. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Amendment of Class E Airspace; Defuniak Springs, FL’’ (RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1067) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2586. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Amendment to Class D and Class E Airspace; Defuniak Springs, FL’’ (RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1067) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2587. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bremerton, WA’’ (RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–1067) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2588. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Establishment and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenville, SC’’ (RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0044) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2589. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Establishment and Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Defuniak Springs, FL’’ (RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1067) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
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law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take- off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (54); Amtd. No. 1364”) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2596. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (6); Amtd. No. 3649” (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2597. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fishery by Non-Rockfish Program Citations; Using “Pacific Fish Gear in the Western and Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648–XE0904) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2598. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Squids in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648–XE0702) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2599. A communication from the Deputy Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries” (RIN0648–BD064) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2600. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2015 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications” (RIN0648–XD742) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2601. A communication from the Acting Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Mid-Atlantic States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Mid-Atlantic Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessel Operations in the Mid-Atlantic; Department of Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

EC–2606. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648–XE0905) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2607. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648–XE0907) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2609. A communication from the Deputy Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2015 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean” (RIN0648–XD972) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2611. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Acetic Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9930–30–OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2612. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerance” (FRL No. 9930–96–OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2613. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9930–30–OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2614. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fundex Tolerance” (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0091; FV15–92–1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2615. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Asian Longhorned Beetle Quarantine Areas in Massachusetts and New York” (Docket No. APHIS–90–128–1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2616. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fruit, Vegetable, and Specialty Crop Import Sanitation and Regulatory Requirements to Add Electronic Form Filing Option” (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0093; FV15–94–1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2617. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Processed Raspberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Late Payment of Interest Charges on Past Due Assessment” (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0042) received during adjournment of the Senate in
the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2619. A communication from the Federal Reserve System, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended: Defense Service Members and Dependents; Final Rule" (RIN0790–A110) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2619. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of Military Construction Funds" (RIN0790–A152) (DFARS Case 2014–D006) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2620. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of Military Construction Funds" (RIN0790–A151) (DFARS Case 2014–D005) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2623. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Network Penetration Reporting Requirements for Command and Control Services" (RIN0790–A161) (DFARS Case 2013–D018) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2624. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of Military Construction Funds" (RIN0790–A165) (DFARS Case 2014–D021) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2625. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Richard P. Mills, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

EC–2627. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2628. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of Military Construction Funds" (RIN0790–A152) (DFARS Case 2014–D006) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2629. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Data Requirements Rule for the 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9920–OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

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

EC–2631. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Data Requirements Rule for the 2010 Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9920–OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2632. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Data Requirements Rule for the 2010 Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9920–OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2633. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Lavanduly Sulfonic Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9930–16–OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2634. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Data Requirements Rule for the 2010 Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9920–OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2635. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled: "Annual Report to Congress on the Presidential $1 Coin Program"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2636. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Registration Process for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants" (RIN3235–AL16) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2637. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Pay Ratio Disclosures" (RIN3235–AL14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2638. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Registration Process for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants" (RIN3235–AL16) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2639. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Chartering and Field of Membership Manual" (RIN3133–AE31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2640. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Chartering and Field of Membership Manual" (RIN3133–AE31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

EC–2642. A communication from the Associate General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Chartering and Field of Membership Manual" (RIN3133–AE31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2643. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards; Final Rule" (RIN3133–AE31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2644. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled: "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards; Final Rule" (RIN3133–AE31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.
of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

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

EC–2647. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012, with respect to Russia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

EC–2649. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Removal of Special Comprehensive License Provisions’’ (RIN0994–AG13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2650. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People’s Republic of China of items not described in Executive Order 13322 on nonproliferation to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.


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


EC–2654. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Auxiliary Installations, Replacement Facilities, and Siting and Maintenance Regulations’’ (RIN1002–0128) (Docket No. RM12–11–000) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

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


EC–2658. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ‘‘OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2016’’; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2659. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ‘‘Spawning Conditions, Fishery Management Plan for the Atlantic Fishery, as adopted at Lisbon, Portugal on September 28, 2007 (Rept. No. 114–120)’’ received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2660. A communication from the Departmental Privacy Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule entitled ‘‘Privacy Act Regulations; Exemption for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board’’ (RIN1090–AB10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 25, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2661. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ‘‘Continued Threat Posed by Dangerous Synthetic Drugs by Amending the Controlled Substances Act to Make Improvements and Technical Corrections, for Other Purposes’’ (FRA–2015–0015) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2662. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Electronically Addressable Thermostats’’ (RIN1904–AD79) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 298. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

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

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

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

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

S. 559. At the request of Mr. Gardner, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and for other purposes.
S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 626

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

S. 741

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

S. 804

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

S. 843

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

S. 890

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

S. 928

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

S. 993

At the request of Mr. Franken, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Reed) were added as cosponsors of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1130

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

S. 1135

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

S. 1150

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

S. 1333

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

S. 1335

At the request of Mr. Gardner, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Tillis) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1335, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marijuana, and for other purposes.

S. 1375

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

S. 1504

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

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. Casey, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1562

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

S. 1608

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

S. 1611

At the request of Mr. Sanders, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Franken) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1611, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes.

S. 1612

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

S. 1693

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

S. 1833

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

S. 1832

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

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. Casey, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Leahy) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1656, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.
At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1836, a bill to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

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

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

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WITWER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1852, a bill to amend and title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure health insurance coverage continuity for voluntary employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for suspension and removal of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct that is a threat to public health or safety and to improve accountability of employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1878, a bill to extend the pediatric priority review voluntary program.

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), were added as cosponsors of S. 1886, a bill to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1919, a bill to extend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPAO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1922, a bill to provide States with flexibility to use Federal IV-E funding for State child welfare programs to improve safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for all children who need child welfare services.

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1944, a bill to require each agency to repeal or amend 1 or more rules before issuing or amending a rule.

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1955, a bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for equitable allotment of land to Alaska Native veterans.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1957, a bill to require the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information from certain financial service providers required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1966, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for program delivery.

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1986, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer credit checks against prospective and current employees for the purposes of making adverse employment decisions.

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1998, a resolution designating the week beginning September 13, 2015, as “National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week.”

**AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED**

SA 2640. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SA 2641. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2642. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SA 2643. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2644. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2643 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2645. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2646. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2647. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2646 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2648. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2647 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2649. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2648 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2650. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2649 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.
TEXT OF AMENDMENTS
SA 2640. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

   Strike line three and all that follows and insert:
   That Congress does not favor the agreement transmitted by the President to Congress on July 19, 2015, under subsection (a) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (42 U.S.C. 2166e) for purposes of prohibiting the taking of any action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to such agreement under subsection (c)(2)(B) of such section.

SA 2641. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

   At the end add the following.
   "This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment."

SA 2642. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2641 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

   Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

SA 2643. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

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

SA 2644. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2643 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

   Strike "3" and insert "4".

SA 2645. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

   At the end add the following.
   "This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment."

SA 2646. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

   Strike "5" and insert "6".

SA 2647. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2646 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

   Strike "6" and insert "7".

CELEBRATING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS OF THE UNITED STATES
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Small Business Development Centers of the United States be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to consider the resolution (S. Res. 243).

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 243) celebrating the 35th anniversary of the Small Business Development Centers of the United States.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 243) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of August 5, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

APPOINTMENTS
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand appointments were made during the adjournment of the Senate, and I ask they be stated for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 106-286, appoints the following Member to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China: The Honorable Ben Sasse of Nebraska.

The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: David Schiappa of Maryland.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2015
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, September 9, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that the time from 2:15 p.m. until 7 p.m. also be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and that the time from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. be controlled by the Democrats and the time from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. be controlled by the majority.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:25 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 9, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS
Executive nominations received by the Senate:
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL

[List of officers' names]

To be lieutenant colonel

[Further list of officers' names]
September 8, 2015
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The following named Army Reserve of the United States Army for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 624.

To be lieutenant commander

ENRIQUE R. ASUNCION
VERONI D. BIRD
ROBERT S. COOPER
CAROL Y. CREEK
LAWRENCE O. CORFZ
CLINTON FORD
TIMOTHY J. SAXON

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 624.

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTIAN J. AUGER
MICHAEL T. AUGUSTYN
JOHN P. CASLDO
JONATHON K. CHARFAUBOS
BRIAN W. CHRISTENSEN
PIETR J. A. DANIEL
DANN C. ELLES
EDWARD A. FOSSON
DANIEL J. B. GUITERREZ
KATHLEEN A. GUITERREZ
THOMAS D. HALLAM
CARL A. HANSEN
HEATHER M. HESS
MICHAEL R. HIGHTOWER
WESLEY J. HOWARD
JOSHUA L. IACOVONE
MATTHEW J. JEPSON
KIMBERLY J. MAZUR
SETH C. MOGUSSER
JAMES B. MCKELVY
KONNIE A. MOEZIS
RACHEL M. MUSSER
ROSS A. PENROD
AUSTIN A. RASCHBA
JASON E. RAY
CHRISTOPHER A. SANDMIRL
TYLER R. SCRARAB
JASON A. SCHECHTER
JAMES O. SHAMSHEE
RAFAEL R. SUAKO
ROBERT M. SYR
SHAWN E. TALLEY
RYAN W. THRUN
RUSSELL B. TERRENCE
BRYAN K. WILSON
BILLY D. WOODWARD
CHERSTY J. WYCOFF

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army Reserve of the United States Army for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 624.

To be lieutenant commander

CARA M. ADDITION
EMILIE K. BALSON
KRIST B. BAO
BRYAN C. BALTZ
RONDISHA T. BRASLEY
TIMOTHY D. BRISTROM
NATASHA T. BODE
JOSHDUBA J. BURES
CHRISTINA R. CATAANO
THERRSA J. CHAMP
ANDREW A. CLAYTON
ROSS B. ERICSON
KYLE FRALICK
NICOAUCS G. GREUSDEN
PAUL T. HOSCHMUTZER, JR.
LATHAM T. HUDSON
TOGG D. RUTCHISON
PATRICK O. JACKSON
MICHAEL E. JONES
NICHOLAS J. KAYS
DANIEL B. LEARY
JENNIFER L. MYERS
AUDREY M. NICHOLS
LEAH A. ODDEN
JASON A. PFEL
ZACREY W. FEAGRE
MATTHEW T. ERICKSON
CHRISTOPHER M. RENTRUS
MARK W. RICHBUSHON
BRIAN R. ROACH
JAMIE K. SAINI
JULIE SHERMANHUIS
UNOSHA M. S. SMITH
JEREMY L. SLESSN
MALARY H. SOLLER
MATTIE E. SONY
BRENNA E. STENTIFORD
LISA A. SQUIRES
PAUL H. THOMPSON
AARON D. WALDO
KERRY M. WALKER
ALEXANDER R. WANN
DANNY W. WANGING
JONI A. WHITE

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 624.

To be lieutenant commander

OLUWAFADAKEEMI A. ADEWITAN
RICHARD D. BARTOL III
JARED C. BECK
ERI L. BISHOFF
STEPHEN R. BLACK
ROBERT J. BLOCK
MICHAEL A. BOHMAN
JEREMY G. E. BOSCH
BRANDON K. CALLAWAY

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 624.

KARL M. CHANDLER
ALAN H. CHEN
ANTHONY R. CHIA
JAMES C. COMMONSBY
THOMAS G. CORDER
PFEESTON M. CRIDDLER
JACINTA A. DANIELSON
CATILYN D. DARCEY
ROBYT K. DAVE
RAI A. M. DAVON
KRISTEN M. EIDTARA
BRIAN D. EVANS
KIRINNE K. H. FAN
AMANDA A. FIX
STUART C. FRY
WILLIAM H. GALLAGHER
JOHN M. GREEN III
KARLEK S. JAIN
JACOB M. RAVIN
TATYNN N. HAZBUN
BRINT H. HIEBERT
ANDREW J. HOPPE
PATRICK A. HUNTER
STEPHEN B. HUTTON
SHIN J. KU
YALE A. LEE
HERI J. LEGAS
JAMES C. M. LISH
JASON L. LIPSON
CHRISTOPHER P. MALY
RICHARD A. MCKINNERY, JR.
KRISTINA B. MENDOGA
EVAN P. MOODY
ALEX D. PAUL
DAVID G. QUINTERO
MONICA E. RANHOUR
NICOLE M. REDDOUT
JESSICA S. REDDOUT
OSCAR A. RODRIGUEZRAMOS
NICOLAS K. ROSS
BLAKE M. ROSACKER
GRANT R. RUTHERFORD
JAMES A. SHAW
KELLY B. SLICHTER
VICTOR J. SLAVOV
JEFFREY T. SMITH
DOUGLAS D. SNY
WALTER D. THOMAS
JUSTIN I. WATSON

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army Reserve of the United States Army for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 624.

To be lieutenant commander

FREDERICK ALSHBA
CHRISTOPHER A. ALLEN
ALEX P. AMBER
IAN E. ARRI
JENNIFER M. ARY
HEATHER M. BOWMAN
CHRISTOPHER M. BUCHANAN
FAYE J. BUỉnh
REYNALDO R. CARATA
DON C. CADY
LUPEI CHOU
MICHAEL J. COLLINS
SHELLEY CONYBER
VAUGHN G. COPPER
MARK A. COWANS, JR.
SHANNON M. DAVIS
LEIGH D. DAVIS
JAMES A. DAVIS
CHARLES M. DEHLER
JUSTIN T. DEVORE
RYAN P. DIFIOLO
MICHAEL B. DIPSEROPO
REBECCA E. DREMMAN
CRAIG T. DZIEWIATKOWSKI
DAVID C. EGGERS
MALCOLM L. ELLIOTT
MELISSA S. FLYNN
ZACH E. GOLDSTERN
MELISSA A. GONZALEZ
HERMAN A. GREGG
DANIEL R. GUNNELL
MARK A. GUSTIN
ADAM L. HAMILTON
BRIAN H. HAYS
NATHAN T. HAYWARD
EDWARD W. HERRIBERT IV
LUKE J. HOGES
ALEJANDRA HOLCH
STEVEN A. HOLM
RYAN E. HUMWOD
MICHAEL D. KEY
JONATHAN M. KREIN
MICHAEL D. LABBE
RHYON J. LANCLOS III
QUINTIN E. LEASE
SOMERWA LI
JEFFREY D. LEE
JASON F. MAES
CABRENDREON MCCLEIR
ANDREW R. MICHIEL
HOWARD A. MILLER
JOSHUA M. MILLNER
STEPHANIE C. MOFFANO
JASON A. MONTE
BENJAMIN A. MUNIR III
BRIAN G. NIVEN
RACHEL D. OBERG
JOHN A. OLAH
ROCIO L. OTTMA
STEVE L. PHANH
The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be lieutenant commander

Matthew C. Poff
Benjamin J. Jenkens
John R. Bensing
Leann R. Biley
Petter J. Rivera
William D. M. Rombos
Manuel Roslos
Padi J. Sacre
Christopher M. Sander
Marcus C. Sangle
Matthew J. Schaefer
Jane J. Schottman
John B. Schrist
Sarah S. Serbin
Gina M. Slaby
Cindy Saavedra-Villafane
John E. Summre
Purnhat Srakaouw
Sean M. Teter
Michael B. Vallee
Troy H. Whitefield
James R. Whittow, Jr.
Daniel E. Williamson
Edward P. Windas
Timothy J. Winn
Franke J. Yu

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be lieutenant commander

Jared C. Lesse:

Matthew P. Ahrin
Cherish P. Ayala
John R. Aysworth
Kenneth D. Babers
Kathryn R. Bautista
Sherry M. Benjamin
Carl W. Bennett III
Nichole D. Benson
Tomomi H. Bridge
Anghirina D. Brannon
Elton M. Bratton
Tracey L. Burkey
Jason E. Carmichael
Sarah E. Cerfano
Baquir H. Chambers
John G. Chand
Esther M. Colbert
Tanya A. Coppa
Graciela C. Crawford
Anussada C. Cromer
Nikolai C. Cuthbertson
Angelina R. Davidsen
Karin E. Dower
Anthony P. Duran, Jr.
Sara D. Edmondson
Jessica R. Faul
Michelle L. Finley
Robert D. Gibson
April A. Gilbreath
Danehill M. Glassy
Kevin T. Guthrie
Samuel L. Hamish
Emily S. Harp
Nabila P. Haywood
Christine D. Higgins
James P. Ayala
Anthony N. Horn
Miranda H. Horne
Kayla A. Horst
Sarah C. Hurley
Douglas J. Johnson
Sondra L. Jolly
Thomas W. Kannon
Rein L. Kerr
Meggie L. King
Candice S. Klein
Kathrin R. Kostka
Amy D. Kramer
Lani A. Kuhlow
Shane L. Lattimer
Nathan J. Lee
Tiaoe Lester
Andy G. Lum
Jennifer R. Lynd
Christopher A. Lynn
Konstanze C. Mack
Charlene G. Mahalanski
Cameron F. Mathes
Ricky R. McCallister
Shelby K. McCarter
David B. M. McDonald
Matthew T. Moore
Rachel M. Naidoys
Derek W. Owens
N经营 I. Paul
Jeanne L. Peralta
Sheila Phillips
Jenni A. Pierce
Jackie L. Ponce
Jaqueline E. Price
Chasity R. Reid
Autumn J. Roddell
Bebeca L. Strong
Lauren T. Susan
Hil H. Tambook
Laura A. Tate
Devon J. Tjoffers
Schadag Tqoraks
William L. Westbrooks
Malinda V. Wilford
Caraia M. Wilson

To be lieutenant commander

James P. Adefew
Molly A. Avery
Tanya N. Bates
Jeremy O. Beaz
Hind L. Bier
Gregory W. Bojig
Michael P. Bowker
Clifton D. Butler
Kirsten M. Carlson
Mary E. Caya
Stephanie C. Clappier
Ashley N. Coglitore
Douglas E. Cole, Jr.
Walter J. Colvin, Jr.
Rachel J. Condon
Travis W. Cook
Brendan D. Cox
Tara J. Dariano
Richard J. Dodge
Sonja M. D'Alessandro
Ryan F. Durand
Patrick J. Dougherty
Stephen M. Doig
Mathew E. English
Michael L. Fishr
Jason S. Gallo
Linda C. Gallas
Gregory D. Gentry
Marissa L. Green
Kathy J. Gucciardo
Marc D. Rains
Franca S. Harari
Linda D. Havens
Hlatrier C. Hendrikse
Macedonio M. Herrero
Christine Hiers
Derek B. Hoffman
Darci E. Hook
Megan I. Bowey
Brian A. Howard
Alan D. Huber
Brantta J. Jensen
Amanda L. Jimenez
Joshua I. Kalet
Brinna S. Kelly
Michael W. Keim
Christopher R. Kuntz
Carlos A. Lainson
Eric K. Lenzheiner
Stephanie M. Long
William P. Martin, Jr.
Beth M. Mattison
Amy E. McAllister
Jennifer J. McLaughlin
Greg P. Mendes
Cassandra G. Montalvo
Shawn M. Moreau
Adelle J. D. Morey
Franklin E. J. Muhammad
Anne E. Moody
Kirth D. Nemepoth
Hatherly M. Neumeyer
Robert P. B. Nevins
David Noriega
Jason J. Norris
Donald T. Ordinoado
Michael D. Owen
John D. Pavlaca, Jr.
Katherine E. Pierce
Brian L. Pike
Brooke W. Platt
Erica L. Poole
Luke P. Queckesrauc
David W. Rennen
Christopher T. Ragsdale
Baxanne M. Rau
Hatherly A. Redding
Kai J. T. Robinson
Stephan E. Rogers
Katheryn C. Rooney
Gary B. Rothery
Andrew C. Rutledge
Jill L. J. Sallie
Nicholas C. Scola
Scottot E. Soder
Kwaja G. Snaer
Steven L. Sorensen
Michael W. Terezen
Dawn W. Torosch
Christopher J. Udell
Joria A. Valdez
David P. Varency
William J. Waldrics
Robert C. Ward
Thomas G. Warner, Jr.
David L. Wheeler, Jr.
Kevin R. Whiteman
Jennifer L. Wick
Jensima S. Woody
Jason W. Wright
Martin B. Wright
Hao Xir

To be lieutenant commander

Adam L. Zeiler
Mareas C. J. Zener

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

Richard R. Austin
Chantal N. Auffriedle
Haydar M. Badr
Daniel R. Algert
Lesley P. Algert
William C. Anderson
Cody A. Armstrong
Kristina A. Aubrest
David F. Auirdemora
Kristen D. Auirdemora
Mary M. Bailey
Neal J. Baker
Angelo G. Baulier
Matthew P. F. Bauer
Terrence D. Baxley
Jeremy E. Benjaman
Daniel J. Bemudus
Michelle C. Belso
Benjamin D. Benony
Jeremy T. Bouchard
Elaine C. Brandon
Mark E. Brock
Taylor J. Brown
Timothy P. Bruck
Kerry L. Buckley
Ryan T. Buckly
Sahar B. Buckley
Sarah S. Budina
Patrick J. Burkanadelara
Mareina D. Burg
Nathan S. Buttnier
William J. Butkie
Amelia E. Bynon
William E. Bylund
Kristopher E. Carter
Kristi L. Carlseman
Allen D. Cleary
Benjamin C. Cleary
Grant K. Cochran
Gifford J. Cole
Brielle L. Cordaro
Paul Filip
Chris A. Cruz
Nicholas A. Darlings
Christopher A. Davis
Daniel J. Dean, Jr.
Derek L. Deneh
John B. Dennis
Andrea P. Deschur
Victoria M. Derviokao
Nicholas W. Drjrok
Brijamid L. Douglas
Steven E. Ely
Jennifer K. Engkaluka
John K. Evans II
Sara K. Faught
Kaycey R. Flaseu
Rafiq R. Fudhini
Lyinn M. Flowes
Stephanie M. Fowlke
Samuel D. Frasier
McCala A. Glaude
Karen G. Gacina
Alejandro J. Garcia-Salas
Brittany K. Gavath
Judith C. Genjiroso
John W. Gillingsh
Luke A. Gilman
Jonathan K. Gower
Jennifer N. Graham
Tatiana M. Griner
Alex A. Gutweiler
Skan P. Haught
Kint M. Hall
Erin R. S. Hamersley
Tabor G. Hastings
Heather N. Hauke
Niel M. Hauff
Mark B. Hayley
Nathan J. Hemelry
Andrew D. Laufer
Sander H. Hendry
Evan M. Hidrag
Marshall M. Hoffman
Patricia E. Hoxton
Kevin T. Hollemar
Jameis A. Hollocher
Anais E. Jan
Michelle D. Jardonnais
Jennifer L. Jartweck
Ling Jing
Michael W. Johns
Blanca C. Karros
De Kroot
Iuliama Kilmentmshalauna
Daniel P. Kukie
Scott A. Kunz
Casey E. Lafferty
Joseph E. Lagrow II
Eric C. Larsen
Scott M. Laymon
Joseph A. Le
Tuvie Le
Blair C. Lee
Benjamin J. Lehmnn
William A. Lewis
Katheryn A. Lipcomb
Matthew C. Lomela
Lance A. Lopez
To be captain

MICHHELLE D. CARTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETSARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JOHN C. WALSH
SCOTT C. WAGNER
RUTH A. TREVINO
PAUL C. TALISE
MICHAEL S. STRATTON
KRISTI K. STONEGARZA
LORETTA L. STEIN
HELEN M. STEELE
LEITH J. STATES
GREGORY R. STAEHELI
ADAM G. SONGER
RYAN W. SNOW
CHRISTOPHER D. SKEEHAN
JACOB E. SINGER
BRETT P. SIMMONS
JOSEPH A. SIEGEL
DANIEL B. SEEGER
STEPHANIE A. SCULLY
JAMIE K. OVERBEY
TODD G. OSBORNE
ERIK J. OLSON
BIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETSARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JOHN C. WALSH
SCOTT C. WAGNER
RUTH A. TREVINO
PAUL C. TALISE
MICHAEL S. STRATTON
KRISTI K. STONEGARZA
LORETTA L. STEIN
HELEN M. STEELE
LEITH J. STATES
GREGORY R. STAEHELI
ADAM G. SONGER
RYAN W. SNOW
CHRISTOPHER D. SKEEHAN
JACOB E. SINGER
BRETT P. SIMMONS
JOSEPH A. SIEGEL
DANIEL B. SEEGER
STEPHANIE A. SCULLY
JAMIE K. OVERBEY
TODD G. OSBORNE
ERIK J. OLSON
BIA

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 624.

JAMES W. WESTBROOK
ANN V. WHEELAN
JONATHAN D. WILDI
JESSICA A. WILSON
KEVIN F. WILSON
MICHAEL E. WOLF
HELEN L. WOODRIDGE
DAVID J. ZELINSKAS

THE JUDICIARY

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 8, 2015.