

the brothers want today? What they want today is a vote against this Bank, contrary to the needs of the American people. The Koch brothers distributed a survey to the Republican Presidential hopefuls that essentially obligates those candidates to oppose the Ex-Im Bank.

I ask my colleagues today: Are you working for the American people or are you doing the dirty work for a couple of billionaire oil barons? A vote for the Export-Import Bank is a vote for American families. A vote against the repeal of ObamaCare is a vote for American families. Today, the Senate Democrats will vote for American families.

I was hoping to say a word about Senator INHOFE while he was on the floor, and unfortunately he is not here now. The senior Senator from Oklahoma is a very conservative Republican Senator. He and I disagree on a lot of things, but I have great respect for his courage on this legislation. I think this legislation, which we are moving forward on, is far from perfect, but I listened to Senator JIM INHOFE yesterday when he was answering the President. A Republican always follows the President. I think Senator INHOFE did a fine job of explaining how important it is that we have a transportation bill. We have said a lot of nice things about Senator BOXER, but it is time we said some nice things about JIM INHOFE because this bill would not be where it is without his efforts.

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 resume consideration of H.R. 22, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 22) to amend 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.

Pending:

McConnell modified amendment No. 2266, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Kirk) amendment No. 2327 (to amendment No. 2266), to reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

McConnell amendment No. 2328 (to amendment No. 2327), to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 entirely.

McConnell amendment No. 2329 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2266), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2330 (to amendment No. 2329), to change the enactment date.

Cruz motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair that Cruz amendment No. 2301 is not in order because it is inconsistent with the Senate's precedents with respect to the offering of amendments, their number, degree, and kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask through the Chair if the Democratic leader has a request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, has the bill been reported?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been reported.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before the 3 p.m. vote that Senator BOXER be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes and that Senators WYDEN and MURPHY be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask if the Democratic leader would modify his request to give me 12 minutes and Senator HATCH 10 minutes following Senators BOXER, WYDEN, and MURPHY.

Mr. REID. Why does the Senator from Tennessee get so much time? But I don't object, Mr. President. Just before the vote.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Just before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, someone was speaking with me. What is the order? I get up to 10 minutes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has up to 10 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, it is Sunday, and it is unusual for us to be here, but as I have said many times, this is the reason we are here. Look at this photo. This is the bridge collapse in California, and there is another report coming that says this is going to be far from the last one we have.

This is a bridge that carries thousands of people a day from California to Arizona. This can happen in any one of our States, and the fact is we need to pass a transportation bill. I am so grateful to my colleague Senator INHOFE and to everyone on that committee who got this started.

The Environment and Public Works Committee had a 20-to-0 vote so we don't have to face this anymore. After that, we had other committees act, just not in as bipartisan a fashion, so it was difficult. At that point, Leader MCCONNELL and Senator DURBIN stepped in with Senator INHOFE and me, and all we did was try to get to where we are right now, which is a place where we can pass a fair funding bill.

I have a list. It is very interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL SHARE OF EACH STATE'S CAPITAL OUTLAYS FOR HIGHWAY & BRIDGE PROJECTS

State	Percentage
Rhode Island	102
Alaska	93
Montana	87
Vermont	86
South Carolina	79
Hawaii	79
North Dakota	78
Wyoming	73
South Dakota	71
Connecticut	71
New Mexico	70
Idaho	68
Alabama	68
New Hampshire	68
Missouri	65
Mississippi	65
Colorado	64
Minnesota	64
Oklahoma	63
Arkansas	62
Georgia	62
Tennessee	62
West Virginia	61
Iowa	59
Ohio	58
Virginia	57
Maine	57
Wisconsin	55
Oregon	54
Indiana	54
New York	54
District of Columbia	52
California	49
Nevada	49
Arizona	49
Nebraska	49
Kansas	49
Louisiana	48
North Carolina	48
Maryland	48
Texas	47
Pennsylvania	46
Washington	45
Kentucky	44
Michigan	41
Delaware	41
Florida	39
Illinois	39
Utah	38
Massachusetts	37
New Jersey	35

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, my State counts on the Federal Government for one-half of its transportation funding, highways, and transit. Rhode Island counts on the Federal Government for 100 percent; Alaska, 93 percent; Montana, 87 percent; South Carolina, 79 percent; Hawaii, 79 percent; North Dakota, 78 percent; Wyoming, 73 percent; Connecticut, 71 percent; New Mexico, 70 percent, and it goes down from there, but the vast majority of our States count on the Federal Government for funding.

What we have done, as both Senators REID and MCCONNELL have pointed out, is we just keep patching up the highway trust fund.

I could go to a bank and say: I want to buy a House. The banker says: You have great credit. That's the good news. The bad news is you can only get a 5-month mortgage. What would I do in that case? I would sadly walk away. I can't afford to invest in a home if I have only 5 months of a mortgage. It is the same way with the States. The way the House went about it, and the way some of my colleagues on both sides want to handle it, is another 5-month extension, and our States are stopping.

On Tuesday, the general contractors told us that in 25 States they have

begun to lay off many, many, many construction workers. We all know at the height of the great recession we had millions of unemployed construction workers. It has been tough to get them back to work, and remember the businesses that employ them, it has been tough to get them back to work.

It has been so hard and now we are seeing a reversal of all the hard work we did because we did a 2-year transportation bill that was helpful. This would be the first 6-year authorization in decades and the first 3-year funding, I believe, in 10 years. It could be more. We need to do this.

I want to close by saying this: Working across the aisle is always difficult, but it is exciting, it is interesting, and the staffs from both sides have shown they can do it.

Last night, I was on the phone with Senator MCCONNELL's staff—I think it was 20 minutes until 12—and I kept saying: If we can't fix this, I have to call the Senator. They said: Please don't. Well, we worked it out this morning.

I see the Senator from Rhode Island Mr. WHITEHOUSE is coming in now. I told the Senators that Rhode Island counts on this Federal highway trust fund for 100 percent of the funding. I also did not mention that Senator WHITEHOUSE is on the Environment and Public Works Committee. He is a very active and productive member. There is a program in there that is important to all of our States—major programs that will finally have a fund, regardless of whether it is Kentucky, Utah, Rhode Island or California.

This is a fair bill. It has a good increase for highways and a good increase for transportation. States and cities want it. Yesterday, I found out from Senator INHOFE—who, by the way, did a terrific national radio address on this issue, and I thank him for that—that the mayor from Oklahoma City and the mayor from New York City wrote a letter saying how desperately they need the certainty. We are on the cusp.

AMENDMENT NO. 2327

Mr. President, I personally support the Ex-Im Bank. I know my colleague Senator MCCONNELL and I do not agree on this. I think the Ex-Im Bank is important.

We should not forget that we are still recovering from the worst recession since the Great Depression. We need to stay focused on putting people back to work, creating jobs, and growing the economy.

We can do that by passing the transportation bill. I thank my colleagues for working together on this bill, and for their patience with this process. This bill will support millions of jobs and thousands of businesses nationwide, it will help rebuild our country's infrastructure, and it will strengthen our economy.

It will also provide funding certainty for State and local governments and the construction industry, which was

hard hit in the Great Recession. There are approximately 1.4 million fewer construction workers today compared to 2006—which equals roughly 20 percent of all construction jobs—and over 522,000 construction workers remain out of work in the U.S.

The law that authorizes our transportation programs will expire in just 5 days—on July 31st—and the Highway Trust Fund is going to run out of money shortly after that. Many States, including Utah, Arkansas, Georgia, Tennessee, and Wyoming, have delayed or canceled construction projects due to the uncertainty in Federal transportation funding.

We have the opportunity to pass a bill, the DRIVE Act, which is vital for jobs and the economy. Last week, a letter was sent from 68 groups calling on the Senate to vote for a six-year reauthorization of federal surface transportation programs. This letter was signed by labor groups such as the Operating Engineers, the Laborers International, and United Brotherhood of Carpenters, as well as business groups such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the National Retail Federation.

This letter was also signed by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, AASHTO, our State DOTs, who know better than anyone the importance of certainty from a long-term bill.

Today we have the opportunity to do even more to help grow our economy by reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank. I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who worked so hard to reach a bipartisan agreement for a multi-year reauthorization.

At a time when too many of our workers are still looking for jobs, the Ex-Im Bank helps American businesses create jobs. Last year alone, it financed \$27.5 billion in exports for over 3,000 businesses, supporting over 164,000 American jobs. And over the last 6 years, it has supported a total of 1.3 million jobs.

Not only that, the bank helps the United States level the playing field when so many other countries heavily subsidize their exports. The Ex-Im Bank helps American businesses compete fairly.

Even more important, this job creation comes at no cost to the public. The Ex-Im Bank covers its own costs—sometimes even returning money to the Treasury—and maintains a default rate of under 2 percent.

Unfortunately, as of July 1, the Ex-Im Bank has been unable to process any new transactions—and this poses a real threat to our economy. Business deals that are months or years in the making are now on hold, and may fall through, unless we reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank immediately.

Let me tell a few stories about the Ex-Im Bank's impact in California. Since 2009, the Ex-Im Bank has helped almost 1,000 California exporters—702 are small businesses—to make deals to

export \$18 billion in American products.

Here are just a few examples of what the Ex-Im Bank has done for California businesses.

FirmGreen, based in Newport Beach, CA, is a veteran-owned business that converts landfill gas and other renewable resources into renewable energy and clean fuel. Financing from the Ex-Im Bank enabled FirmGreen to lead a landfill gas project in Brazil, which generated 165 new manufacturing jobs across seven States. Unfortunately, FirmGreen recently lost a \$57 million contract because of the uncertainty surrounding the Ex-Im Bank reauthorization. The company's CEO Steve Wilburn put it well recently, "For Congress to create a partisan issue out of a bipartisan entity that is supporting U.S. business and growing jobs simply for the debate is just wrong."

Los Kitos Produce, a minority, woman-owned produce company in Orange, CA, wanted to expand its business to new markets overseas. To reduce the risks involved in selling to new foreign buyers, the company applied for an insurance policy from the Ex-Im Bank. This insurance facilitated \$750,000 in sales and the company's expansion into Colombia and Korea. This helped to increase exports from 5 percent to 25 percent of their total sales.

Martha Montoya, CEO of Los Kitos Produce, said:

Without the Ex-Im Bank, I'd lose my growers' trust to ship overseas. Our growers reinvest everything back into their business and back into their community. They can't afford to risk not being paid. Congress needs to support American small business by reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank. The bottom line is: without Ex-Im Bank, we wouldn't be able to export.

ProGauge Technologies of Bakersfield, CA, manufactures machines that inject steam into reservoirs to thin out oil so it is easier to pump. In recent years, the company received \$15.6 million in Ex-Im loan guarantees. Exports now make up 65 percent of the company's revenue. ProGauge President Don Nelson said:

Without Ex-Im bank, [a lender] would make us put up 100 percent collateral, and we would have no money available for operations. . . . Revenues would go down by about 75 percent and I'd have to lay off between 50 and 60 people. Ex-Im is critical to our business.

The Washington Post reported that ProGauge will have to withdraw its bid for a \$30 million project in the Middle East if the Ex-Im Bank is not reauthorized. "It's going to be devastating for us" said CEO Don Nelson. "Basically, we just won't be able to operate anymore."

Wiggins Lift Company is a small business in Oxnard, CA, that employs over 50 workers and has been family owned for three generations. The Ex-Im Bank recently provided financing of \$1.4 million for Wiggins to export its forklifts to three Brazilian companies. This deal will help to sustain an estimated 30 jobs at Wiggins Lift.

“Ex-Im’s guarantee is a positive for everyone” said Wiggins Lift CEO Michelle McDowell. “These sales are helping us continue to grow, add employees, and contribute to the U.S. economy.”

These are just a few stories of what will be lost if the Ex-Im Bank is not reauthorized. Every day that the Ex-Im Bank is unable to make new loans, more and more businesses will lose opportunities to compete and sell their products worldwide, and that means jobs lost right here in America.

Let’s do the right thing. Let’s reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank. Let’s pass the highway bill. Let’s create jobs and strengthen our economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this important reauthorization.

To sum it up, we have a lot of small businesses that count on the Ex-Im Bank to finance them so they can export our products. We have so many in our State.

I hope it passes on a bipartisan vote, and I thank Leader MCCONNELL. I know this is not something he likes at all, but he made a commitment and he is sticking to it.

Lastly, we are going to have a vote to overturn ObamaCare. Senator HATCH and I were discussing how much we disagree on this point, but I told him I wouldn’t hold back. I think it doesn’t make any sense.

We are looking at millions of people nationwide who now have health insurance and cannot be told by their insurer they have a preexisting condition like high blood pressure or diabetes, forget it. We have so many families that now have their 24-year-old, 25-year-old, 26-year-old on their insurance.

I have stories that will make you feel good—stories from people in my State. One person had her cancer caught at a very early stage, and as a result of that she has lived to tell the tale. Before ObamaCare, she couldn’t have gotten the tests she needed to discover this deadly cancer.

I just say rhetorically to my friends on the other side—and they are my friends. I will tell you, we have really built up some relationships over this bill, which I am so happy about. Why don’t we work together to fix the problems? We know no bill is perfect. The Transportation bill is far from perfect, and we had to fix that too.

Maybe there is a new day dawning. We keep saying that, but it doesn’t seem to be happening. But maybe something good is going to come from the bipartisanship, tough as it has been. The Transportation bill is far from perfect. I wanted to do so much more on safety, and I have to say that Senator NELSON did such a good job. I must have talked to Senator WYDEN half a dozen times. He kept putting on pay-fors that were good, but they were rejected by the other side. We could have done so much more if we had gone that way. We did what we could do, and just as in the trade battle where our

caucus was very split, our caucus is very split here.

I hope we can find enough courage and interest, and most important, keep this in mind: This is, to me, the poster child of why we have come together. This America, this doesn’t look like America. It is wrong, and we can come together and hopefully vote for Ex-Im Bank, against the repeal of ObamaCare, and then move forward with a good cloture vote tomorrow night on our very much compromised bill on transportation—because it is a compromise.

Again, my thanks to people on both sides of the aisle—Democrats, Republicans, and everybody—for moving this along.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 2328

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have spent much of my time in public service working to promote bipartisanship in health care. In fact, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee is here. I think he may speak next. Our colleague from Tennessee Senator ALEXANDER is a cosponsor of my comprehensive health care reform bill. So, for me, bipartisanship and health care policy is enormously important, and there are certainly plenty of ways in which Democrats and Republicans could be working together to strengthen the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be on the menu either today or in this Congress.

Today, instead of looking forward on health care in America, the Senate, on a transportation bill, will have a vote on whether to go backward on health care—backward to the days when health care in America was for the healthy and the wealthy. I specifically used those words because the moment you repeal the Affordable Care Act, millions of Americans lose protection against preexisting conditions. The moment that happens, if you are healthy and wealthy, no sweat, but for the millions who are aren’t, they are back in that abyss where they go to bed at night worried that they may get wiped out the very next morning because they have a preexisting health condition.

Protection for those individuals will be gone the moment the Senate votes. I hope the Senate will not vote for ending the Affordable Care Act this afternoon, but the moment it does, gone is that protection for preexisting conditions. Gone are the tax credits. These are opportunities for Americans to get a little bit of tax relief when hard-working families pay for health insurance—gone when we repeal the Affordable Care Act. Gone would be the protections that bar insurance companies from charging top dollar for rock-bottom coverage. Gone would be the protections for young adults. Right now, they can’t be locked out of their parents’ insurance plans. Gone would be

the protection for individuals to make sure their insurance isn’t canceled the moment they get sick. Once again, pregnancy could be considered a preexisting condition.

So what I think this shows is that this debate is no longer about numbers on a page, bills we write, lots of charts, lots of graphs, lots of small print. But this isn’t an abstraction, when we go back, as I have described, to the days when health care was for the healthy and the wealthy. More than 16 million Americans have gained health insurance coverage by virtue of the Affordable Care Act. Their health is on the line every single time there is a vote to repeal that law. So those are the consequences.

I will wrap up because I see my good friend from Tennessee is here, as well as my Senator and my colleague from Utah. Both of them have joined me repeatedly in trying to promote bipartisan approaches on health care policy. I don’t take a backseat to anybody in this body on working on health care policy in a bipartisan fashion. There is nothing that I think would be more valuable than to have Democrats and Republicans come together, not to talk about repealing this law but to find ways to strengthen it. There is not a law that has been passed that we can’t strengthen. And having spoken with my friend from Utah and my friend from Tennessee repeatedly, I think they know I am serious about reaching out for common ground with respect to this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

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

Mr. WYDEN. The pie-in-the-sky insistence that the Affordable Care Act will be repealed and somehow we will not have the suffering I have just described—that is not reality.

What we ought to do is reject this amendment to repeal the Affordable Care Act and then get back to work in a bipartisan way to strengthen the law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, will the Chair please inform me when 10 minutes has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so notify.

APPEAL OF THE RULING OF THE CHAIR

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today there will be at least three votes. The first, as we have heard, is to end debate on Senator MCCONNELL’s amendment to repeal ObamaCare. The second will be to end debate on the Export-Import Bank. Then there may be a third vote on an appeal by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ, to overturn a ruling of the Chair that an amendment of his is not in order. This is how that came about. On Friday Senator CRUZ offered an amendment regarding Iran.

The Chair ruled that the amendment was not in order because—and this is what the Chair said, in fact—“it is inconsistent with the Senate’s precedents with respect to the offering of amendments.” The Senator from Texas then appealed the ruling of the Chair. His intention today will be to try to obtain a majority vote to overturn the Chair’s ruling.

I respect the Senator’s strong desire to offer his amendment, but I believe he ought to do it within the Senate rules or I believe we should change Senate rules in the way our rules prescribe. If, instead, a majority of Senators agree with the Senator from Texas, the Senate will be saying that a majority can routinely change Senate rules and procedures anytime it wants on any subject it wants in order to get the result it wants. The problem with that, as former Senator Carl Levin of Michigan once said, is that a Senate that changes its rules anytime a majority wants is a Senate without any rules.

Think of it this way. Football season is coming up. Let’s say the Tennessee Titans are playing football against the Indianapolis Colts in Nashville and the home team sets the rules of the game. So when the Titans gain 9 yards, they change the rules to say 9 yards is a first down or when the Colts gain 100 yards, the Titans say: Sorry, you need 110 yards to score a touchdown. No one would want to play such a game. No one would want to watch such a game. No one would respect such a game. That is why every Monday in New York City a team of former National Football League officials reviews every referee’s call and noncall from the previous Sunday’s games played in the NFL. The league wants to make absolutely sure its rules are followed. And the NFL has a rules committee that meets between seasons to consider changes in the rules. It has rules about how to change its rules. The NFL, of course, wouldn’t even consider allowing the Titans to change the rules in the middle of a game in Nashville in order to defeat the Colts.

The U.S. Senate has a rules committee, too, and we have rules on how to change our rules. We should follow those rules. The U.S. Senate is the chief rulemaking body for the United States of America. If we cannot follow our own rules, how can we expect 320 million Americans to follow the rules we write for them? If we render ourselves lawless, how can we expect our fellow Americans to respect and follow the rule of law?

There is a practical problem with what the Senator from Texas seeks to do. If he succeeds, it will destroy a crucial part of what we call the rule of regular order in the U.S. Senate. He will create a precedent that destroys the orderly consideration of amendments. There will be unlimited amendments. There will be chaos. And ironically, while destroying regular order, he wouldn’t get the vote on the Iran

amendment he seeks. That is because if he overrules the Chair and creates another branch of the amendment tree, the Senate leaders have a right to offer an amendment to fill that new branch of the tree before he does.

The U.S. Senate is unique in the world. It has been called the one authentic piece of genius of the American political system. Its uniqueness is based upon a variety of rules, precedents, procedures, and agreements that encourage extended debate. This process encourages consensus, and consensus is the way we govern a complex country, whether it is a civil rights bill or a trade agreement or an education bill. But a body of 100 of us that operates by unanimous consent requires restraint and good will on the part of Senators to function. We saw a good example of that a couple of weeks ago when the Senate passed 81 to 17 in 1 week a complex elementary and secondary education bill. Any Senator could have made that process much more difficult, but not one did, and the country is impressed with that result.

There are different ways—several different ways—to establish Senate rules and procedures, but they all fall under the same umbrella. There are standing rules adopted by the first Senate in 1789 with the advice of Thomas Jefferson. There are standing orders. Sometimes we set rules by passing a law, such as the Budget Act. Sometimes we establish a rule by unanimous consent or by agreeing to a new precedent. Taken together, all of these represent the full body of the Senate’s Rules of Procedure. These Rules of Procedure have several things in common, no matter how they were established. The authority for establishing and changing each of them comes from the same place: article I, section 5 of the United States Constitution. Every one of them can be changed by 67 votes, following rule XXII of the Senate, except that a standing order may be changed with 60 votes.

One other thing these different forms of rules and precedents have in common is that the latest change supercedes whatever rule or precedent was established earlier. So if the Senator from Texas persuades the majority of us to overrule the Chair today, that decision governs the Senate forever until it is changed or unless it is changed. So there is no real difference between changing a rule or changing a precedent. What is important is not how the precedent was established or the rule was established but what is being overturned.

It is true that occasionally the Senate majority uses its power to overturn the ruling of the Chair to refine the interpretation of rules or precedents. This means that in some limited circumstances, the Senate changes its rules by majority vote.

The question today is not whether we can overturn the ruling of the Chair but whether we should overturn the ruling of the Chair. I believe we should

not do so. To do so would destroy regular order in the Senate. It would create chaos in the Senate. Most importantly, a Senate in which a majority routinely changes the rules by overruling the Chair is a Senate without any rules.

There is a right way and a wrong way to change our rules and procedures. This would be the wrong way. I urge my colleagues to not agree with the Senator from Texas in his effort to overturn the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

TREATING EACH OTHER WITH COURTESY AND RESPECT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to address the Senate in my capacity as President pro tempore. I hope my colleagues will give attention to what I am about to say and will take it to heart because I speak from the heart out of respect for my colleagues and out of love for this great body in which we are all privileged to serve.

The Senate has a long and justly celebrated tradition of comity and respect among Members. Although there have been occasional exceptions throughout history, on the whole, Senators have taken great care to treat each other with courtesy and respect, both in private discussions and in public deliberations. We do this for several reasons—first, because mutual respect is essential for us to be able to work together to forge consensus on difficult issues that stir deep and sometimes divisive feelings. Passing meaningful legislation in this body typically requires the two parties to work together, and that, in turn, requires a trust and a certain level of good will. Courtesy and decorum foster an atmosphere where we can work in good faith to find common ground, where we can appeal to nobler instincts to do what is best for all Americans, not just those of a particular partisan persuasion.

The second reason we treat each other with courtesy and respect is because it is the honorable thing to do. We come to this body as 100 men and women with vastly different backgrounds, life experiences, and views on how government should operate. But we share a common humanity and a common goal to improve this great Nation and to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity. We divide into parties and join caucuses. We fight passionately about matters of tremendous consequence. But we do not become enemies. We remain colleagues. And colleagues treat each other with respect. We treat each other with honor even when we feel another has perhaps not accorded us the same esteem. Squabbling and sanctimony may be tolerated in other venues or perhaps on the campaign trail, but they have no place among colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

The third and most important reason we treat each other with courtesy and respect is because we are the people’s representatives. We are not here on

some frolic or to pursue personal ambitions; we are here because the people of the United States have entrusted us with the solemn responsibility to act on their behalf in shaping our Nation's laws. This is a high and holy calling. It is not something to take lightly. It is a sacred trust in which pettiness or grandstanding should have no part. We are here to do serious work. In doing this work, egos will inevitably be bruised. Feelings from time to time may be hurt. This is inherent in the nature of politics. But we are here to carry out the people's business. We serve the people, not our own egos. When we are on the losing side of a particular debate, when we are disappointed, we pick ourselves up and move ahead to the next challenge.

Our Nation's Founders designed the Senate to play a special role in our constitutional system. In contrast to the more raucous, populist House, the Senate was to be a body of deliberation and reasoned judgment. Senators were to seek the common good and consider national, not just parochial, interests in crafting legislation and considering nominees.

Decorum is essential to executing this constitutionally ordained role. Deliberation and reasoned judgment require an atmosphere of restraint, an atmosphere of thoughtful disagreement. Deliberation without decorum is not deliberation at all; it is bickering. And bickering is beneath this body.

Regrettably, in recent times, the Senate floor has too often become a forum for partisan messaging and ideological grandstanding rather than a setting for serious debate. It has been misused as a tool to advance personal ambitions, a venue to promote political campaigns, and even a vehicle to enhance fundraising efforts—all at the expense of the proper functioning of this body. Most egregiously, the Senate floor has even become a place where Senators have singled out colleagues by name to attack them in personal terms and to impugn their character—in blatant disregard of Senate rules which plainly prohibit such conduct.

The Senate floor has hosted many passionate debates on crucial issues over the years. Tempers from time to time have flared. Voices have on occasion been raised. But we have almost universally confined our criticisms to policies and to ideas, to what we think is wrongheaded about particular bills or proposals. We have not, at least in my memory, called our opponents dishonest or sought to disparage their motives.

To bring personal attacks to the Senate floor would be to import the most toxic elements of our current political discourse into the well of the Senate, into the very heart of this institution. This would serve only to pollute our deliberations, to break the bonds of trust that are essential for achieving some measure of consensus, and to invite the dysfunction that so saturates our media and popular culture into this storied Chamber.

For those of us who care about the Senate as an institution and who want it once again to help solve the vexing challenges that face our Nation, such misuse of the Senate floor must not be tolerated. Each of us—Republicans and Democrats alike—must stand together in support of the Senate's time-honored traditions of collegiality and respect. We must stand resolute in requiring that the Senate's formal rules requiring dignity and decorum be observed. And we must ensure that the pernicious trend of turning the Senate floor into a forum for advancing personal ambitions, for promoting political campaigns, or for enhancing fundraising activities comes to a stop. There are enough other platforms for those seeking to accomplish those objectives; the Senate floor need not be one.

Mr. President, I recognize that many of my colleagues are quite new to the Senate and may not yet have had many opportunities to experience its proper institutional role as a forum for reasoned deliberation and constructive debate. Some are less familiar with its traditions of comity and respect. Others may know little of the Senate's history in rising above parochialism and narrow self-interest. And a few, I regret to say, seem unconcerned for its historic pivotal role in promoting consensus and helping to overcome our Nation's challenges.

As one who has had the privilege of serving here for the past four decades, I can attest from firsthand experience that the Senate can be and has been in times not too far past a distinguished and constructive body that does much good. I recall vividly times when this body was marked by good will rather than rancor and disrepute. In some respects, the Senate today is but a mere shadow of its former self, another casualty of the permanent political campaign. This is deeply disheartening to those like myself who were here to experience this body's better days, and it has severely damaged the proper governance of our Nation.

Mr. President, I have been frank in my remarks today. This candor stems from my genuine concern for this body and its future. I have been frank because I have seen so much of what I love about this body frittered away in recent years for small-minded, shortsighted, partisan gain. By virtue of my long service here in the Senate and my role as President pro tempore, I am a dedicated institutionalist. I care deeply about this institution and want it to work.

Our current majority leader has made important strides in putting the Senate back on a path toward meaningful deliberation and constructive lawmaking aimed at the common good, but his efforts and those of other Senators on both sides of the aisle who take the long view in seeking to build up this institution will not suffice unless each one of us is committed to instilling comity and respect as a core feature of everything we do.

Let's each move forward with a renewed sense of honor and respect, a resolve not to tolerate misuse of the Senate floor, a commitment to do our part to restore civility and constructive debate as defining characteristics of this body, and a renewed willingness to work together for the good of all Americans.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

APPEAL OF THE RULING OF THE CHAIR.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Utah for an excellent speech. I entirely agree with his call for civility and decorum and respect. No Member of this body should engage in ad hominem attacks directed at any other Member of this body, be they a Republican or be they a Democrat. At the same time, I would note that it is entirely consistent with decorum and with the nature of this body traditionally as the world's greatest deliberative body to speak the truth. Speaking the truth about action is entirely consistent with civility. Indeed, in a quote often falsely attributed to George Orwell, the sentiment has been expressed thusly: "In a time of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act."

I would make four brief points.

First of all, on Friday I gave an unusual speech—a speech unlike any I have given in this Chamber. It was not a speech I was happy to give. It was a speech to which the senior Senator from Utah has responded. I would note that in the course of that speech I described an explicit promise the majority leader had made to me and to all 53 Republican Senators. Neither the majority leader, nor the Senator from Utah, nor the Senator from Tennessee has disputed that the majority leader, in front of every Republican Senator, made that promise, looking me in the eyes—namely, that there was no deal on the Export-Import Bank, that its proponents could offer it in the regular order and there would be no special preferences whatsoever. We saw on Friday that promise was false.

In particular, on the amendment on the Export-Import Bank, first of all, it was not offered by its proponents, it was called up by the majority leader. Very few of us get our amendments called up by the majority leader because he has priority of recognition, he can edge out any other amendment in this Chamber.

Secondly, the majority leader followed that by filling the tree—a procedural mechanism that he had often decry when the former majority leader employed it to block other amendments.

Third, the majority leader filed cloture on the Export-Import Bank amendment—a tool he has used only once in his entire tenure as majority leader.

Those were extraordinary steps designed to force a vote to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, and they were

directly contrary to the promises the majority leader made to all 53 Republicans and to the press. My saying so may be uncomfortable, but it is a simple fact entirely consistent with decorum, and no Member of this body has disputed that promise was made and that promise was broken.

The senior Senator from Tennessee gave a learned speech on changing the rules of this body through appealing the ruling of the Chair, and I very much agree. When the former majority leader used the nuclear option, it was wrong to violate the rules. But the amendment tree does not come from the rules, the amendment tree comes from the precedents, and precedents are set precisely through appealing the rulings of the Chair by a majority vote.

Indeed, I would note that previously many Members of this body have voted in favor of overruling the ruling of the Chair, including my friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee, who has voted 4 times in his career to overrule the ruling of the Chair; my friend the majority whip, who has voted 5 times in his career to overrule the ruling of the Chair; and, indeed, the distinguished majority leader, who has voted 14 times in his career to overrule the ruling of the Chair. I would note beyond that, that as recently as April 2, 2014, there was a third-degree appeal precisely like the one I have filed that was filed by Senator VITTER. The ruling of the Chair was appealed, and a significant number of Republicans voted in favor of that appeal, including the majority leader and including the majority whip.

Many Republicans railed against the filling of the tree when the Democratic leader was the majority leader. If it was an abuse of power then, it remains so today. Indeed, I would note what the current majority leader said at the time: "The practical effect of [filling the tree] is to disenfranchise the people I and my members represent, and, more significantly, a significant number of the people his members represent whose voices are simply not heard in the Senate."

Beyond that, let me say on the substance that if you oppose filling the tree to silence the amendments of Members, be they in the majority party or the minority party, you should vote in favor of allowing my amendment to go forward.

I would note that the Senator from Tennessee was incorrect that it would allow unlimited amendments. It would simply add a third branch to the tree and not unlimited amendments.

At the same time, if you are resolved to stand with our friend and ally the Nation of Israel, if you are resolved to stand with American hostages in Iran, and if you are convinced to not lift sanctions on Iran unless and until Iran recognizes Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State and that they release four American hostages, then you should vote to allow that amendment to be voted on.

Needless to say, if you oppose the Export-Import Bank, you should vote to allow that amendment to be voted on.

Finally, if you want other amendments on pressing issues, be they defunding Planned Parenthood, be they stopping sanctuary cities, be they passing Kate's Law, or be they ending the congressional exemption from Obamacare, you should vote in favor of allowing this amendment to be voted on.

A great many Members of this body have given long, eloquent speeches on how this body operates when each Member has a right to offer amendments—and even difficult amendments. We debate and resolve them. That is the heart of this vote, and I would encourage each Member here to vote his conscience or her conscience on both substance and the ability of the Senate to remain the world's greatest deliberative body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have listened to the comments of my colleague, the junior Senator of Texas, both last week and this week, and I would have to say he is mistaken.

First of all, if, in fact, the majority leader had somehow misrepresented to the 54 Senators what the facts are with regard to the Ex-Im Bank, I suspect we would find other voices joining that of the junior Senator, but I hear no one else making such a similar accusation.

Secondly, I would just say to my colleague that there is an alternative explanation. There is an alternative explanation. As the majority leader has said time and time again, anytime 65 Senators want to do something here in the Senate, sooner or later they are going to get their way. Indeed, that represents the vote in support of the Ex-Im Bank—something I will end up voting against but where I realize that majorities will carry the day eventually.

But if the rule the junior Senator from Texas is arguing for is embraced, we will lose all control of the Senate schedule; there will be chaos; and, indeed, we won't be able to meet simple deadlines, such as the one that exists on the 31st of this month with regard to the expiration of the transportation fund, because even after we close off debate, any Senator who wants to get a vote on an amendment will be entitled to do so. And that cannot be the rule. It is not the rule. It has never been the rule. And that is why what the junior Senator is attempting to do is so extraordinary.

I will be opposing that, and I hope all of our colleagues will join us in opposing that because ultimately what that would mean is that a determined 51

Senators who want to raise taxes, who want to pass Obamacare 2.0, who want to pass a cap-and-trade bill or a carbon tax, who want to pass Dodd-Frank 2.0, or any additional government spending—they will be able to do it. They will be guaranteed an opportunity to get an amendment and be able to vote on that amendment, and it will pass in the Senate. I don't think that is in the best interests of the Senate. I don't think it is in the best interests of the 27 million people whom the junior Senator and I represent together. I certainly don't believe that is in the best interests of this institution which we all revere.

If all 100 Senators have the opportunity to offer an amendment without restraint, then there will never be any deadline. There will never be any conclusion, and we would not be able to do the simple work that we have been asked to do on behalf of the American people.

The final point is this. I know the junior Senator feels passionately about this amendment. But the fact of the matter is that we have a process that has been set up to review the Iran deal that President Obama and Secretary Kerry negotiated. We are going to have a chance to examine it, debate it, and review it over the next 2 months, and then we will have a chance to vote on it. There is a time and place for this vote. I will no doubt support the same position that the junior Senator is supporting. It is not on this bill. It is not now. It is not at the expense of breaking the orderly procedures that make sure that everyone gets a chance to participate. I would just say in conclusion that there was no misrepresentation made by the majority leader on the Ex-Im Bank.

The only thing the majority leader promised was an opportunity to offer an amendment on a bill, recognizing that if he denied that opportunity, when 65 Senators wanted it—not just one Senator who we know can stop things around here, slow them down—the 65 Senators would be bound and determined to use any available leverage until they got that vote. So I agree with what the majority leader has decided to do and how he has decided to handle it. I know there are passionate views around here, but that does not justify changing the rules of the Senate through such extraordinary means. So I hope our colleagues join me to ratify the ruling of the Chair when that time comes rather than to overrule it.

To overrule the Chair on something this important to the orderly consideration of the Senate's business would be a terrible mistake.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Tennessee.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum be waived.

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the McConnell amendment No. 2328, to repeal Obamacare.

Mitch McConnell, Marco Rubio, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Dan Sullivan, Michael B. Enzi, John McCain, Joni Ernst, Deb Fischer, Tim Scott, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Daniel Coats, James Lankford, David Perdue, Richard Burr.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2328, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to amendment No. 2327, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 253 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Daines	McConnell	Moran
Enzi		

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Casey	Kaine
Bennet	Donnelly	King
Blumenthal	Durbin	Klobuchar
Booker	Feinstein	Leahy
Boxer	Franken	Manchin
Brown	Gillibrand	McCaskill
Cantwell	Heinrich	Menendez
Cardin	Heitkamp	Merkley
Carper	Hirono	Mikulski

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

NOT VOTING—8

Coons	Markey	Sessions
Corker	Murkowski	Toomey
Flake	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 43.

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

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum be waived on the next vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Kirk amendment No. 2327 to amendment No. 2266, as modified, to H.R. 22, an act to amend 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.

Lindsey Graham, Mark Kirk, Kelly Ayotte, Susan M. Collins, John McCain, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt, Jeanne Shaheen, Thomas R. Carper, Heidi Heitkamp, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Sherrod Brown, Christopher A. Coons, Richard J. Durbin, Amy Klobuchar, Harry Reid.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2327, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, for the Senator from Illinois, Mr. KIRK, to amendment No. 2266, as modified, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted "nay."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 254 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Portman
Blunt	Heller	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Hoeven	Roberts
Brown	Isakson	Rounds
Burr	Johnson	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Scott
Carper	Kirk	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coats	Leahy	Tester
Cochran	Manchin	Udall
Collins	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Ernst	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Moran	
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—26

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Rubio
Capito	Hatch	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	Paul	Vitter
Daines	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—7

Coons	Markey	Toomey
Corker	Sanders	
Flake	Sessions	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 26.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

VOTE ON APPEAL OF THE RULING OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the appeal of the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ, in relation to the offering of his amendment No. 2301, which has been ruled out of order.

No debate is in order pursuant to rule XXII.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. CRUZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

The Senate sustains the decision of the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARPER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CARPER. I withdraw my objection.

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

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 2282, withdrawing Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mrs. BOXER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order.

APPEAL OF THE RULING OF THE CHAIR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appeal the ruling of the Chair and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

The question is on the appeal.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The Senate sustains the decision of the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 2328

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, on Friday, July 24, 2015, as a result of a clerical error, I was inadvertently listed as a cosponsor on McConnell amendment No. 2328.

Today, a unanimous consent request was filed by the majority leader's office to remove my name as a cosponsor of this amendment. I did not cosponsor this amendment, do not support it, and voted against invoking cloture on it today.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING MARINE LANCE CORPORAL SKIP WELLS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, while we have a pause in our business for a moment, I rise to offer a brief but sincere eulogy. At this very moment in Woodstock, GA, Skip Wells, U.S. Marine Corps lance corporal, is being buried and worshipped. Thousands of Georgians are at the First Baptist Church of Woodstock, GA to attend his funeral.

Skip Wells was murdered in Chattanooga, TN, on the 16th day of July while he was doing his duties as a marine, recruiting people to come into the U.S. military.

Skip graduated from Sprayberry High School just a few years ago. He played the clarinet and musical instruments in his church orchestra. He was a great student with thousands of friends. He was a young man we would all be proud of. His life was taken away from us in a snap by an enraged person on a religious tear.

When a young man of 21 years old dies in the prime of life, we ask why. In particular, when he wears the uniform of the U.S. Marine Corps, we ask why.

It is inexplicable. We all know the Book of Ecclesiastes tells us, "There is a time for everything"—a time to be born and a time to die. There is never a time when a young marine's life should be taken. It causes us to truly think about something. As we act in this U.S. Senate and guide our country, hundreds of thousands of young men and women volunteer to wear the uniform of the United States of America, and when they put it on, they never know when that day to die might come, but they have all made the commitment that they are ready, willing, and able to die for the country they love, the United States of America.

To Skip's mother Cathy, his extended family, and all those who knew Skip, we send our condolences and our best wishes for them to recover over time and heal.

In Woodstock, GA, an inscription is being read right now, which I will read on the floor of the Senate so we will read it at the same time. These words are comforting, they mean something, and in a time of grief for all of us, I think they are important. Skip's mother wanted this as a part of the ceremony. It is entitled "To Those I Love."

When I am gone, release me, let me go.
You mustn't tie yourself to me with tears.
Just be happy that we had so many good years.

I gave you my love, you can only guess,
How much you gave to me in happiness.
I thank you for the love you each have shown.

But now it's time I traveled alone.
So grieve a while for me, if grieve you must,

Then let your grief be comforted by trust.
It's only for a while that we must part,
So bless the memories within your heart.
I won't be far away, for life goes on,
So if you need me, call, and I will come.

Though you can't see or touch me, I'll be near.
And if you listen with your heart, you'll hear,
All of my love around you, soft and clear.
And then, when you must come this way alone,
I'll greet you with a smile, and say "Welcome Home."

That is the Book of John, Chapter 15, the 13th verse. "Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends."

Skip Wells laid down his life for all of the people of the United States of America, for his family, and for his friends. We ask God to bless him and bring mercy to his family. We ask God to bless the great country that Skip wore the uniform to die for—the United States of America.

I yield the floor.
I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate 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.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION REPORTING DEADLINE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 2001(a) of S. Con. Res. 11, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, directs the Committees on Finance and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions to report changes in laws within their respective jurisdictions to reduce the on-budget deficit by not less than \$1 billion each for the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025. Those committees were instructed to submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget no later than July 24, 2015.

For the information of colleagues, the reporting deadline has passed and the Budget Committee has not received reconciliation recommendations from either committee. While committees have not complied with the deadline, the Senate retains the ability to utilize the instructions contained in section 2001(a) of S. Con. Res. 11.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 252 on the motion to proceed to H.R. 22. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1861. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1862. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out a pilot program on issuing grants to eligible veterans to start or acquire qualifying businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 271

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 271, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of